

University of Warwick institutional repository: <http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap>

A Thesis Submitted for the Degree of PhD at the University of Warwick

<http://go.warwick.ac.uk/wrap/53018>

This thesis is made available online and is protected by original copyright.

Please scroll down to view the document itself.

Please refer to the repository record for this item for information to help you to cite it. Our policy information is available from the repository home page.

The Life and Works
of
NICOLAS LENGLET-DUFRESNOY
1674-1755

Geraldine F. Sheridan

Thesis presented for the degree of
Ph.D.

to the Department of French Studies
University of Warwick

December 1980

BEST COPY

AVAILABLE

TEXT IN ORIGINAL IS
CLOSE TO THE EDGE OF
THE PAGE

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
INTRODUCTION	1
Notes to Introduction	5
 CHAPTER I (1674-1704)	
Family background	6
First directions in a literary career	31
Notes to Chapter I	40
 CHAPTER II (1705-1714)	
Travel and encounters	52
The eternal opportunist: clergyman or spy	63
Political disgrace and literary success	75
Notes to Chapter II	89
 CHAPTER III (1715-1728)	
Paris under the Regency	101
Vienna: a lost Maecenas	124
Lenglet's political star wanes: death of Le Blanc	140
Notes to Chapter III	152
 CHAPTER IV (1729-1739)	
The abbé as writer: studies in historical methodology	168
Discoveries in early French poetry	181
An apologia for the novel	215
Lenglet exploits his fame	242
Notes to Chapter IV	254

CHAPTER V (1740-1749)

Financial insecurity: the backdrop to the later years	283
New departures: from Voltaire to occultism	293
Modern French history: major editorial achievements	306
Consolidation of established interests	327
Politics and propaganda	341
Notes to Chapter V	360

CHAPTER VI (1750-1755)

Last challenges to authority	386
Lenglet and the encyclopedic spirit	398
France and its history: the final endeavour	415
Notes to Chapter VI	434

CONCLUSION 450

Notes to the Conclusion	469
-------------------------	-----

APPENDIX 471

Notes to the Appendix	484
-----------------------	-----

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Introduction	487
Bibliography I	490
Bibliography II	653

To the memory of my father

Acknowledgement

I wish to express my gratitude to the following people for their help in the course of my research:

- my supervisor, Professor Richard N. Coe, for his expert guidance and critical appraisal
- Dr. Kay Wilkins, who first spoke to me of Lenglet
- Dr. Marian Hobson-Jeanneret, for her invaluable advice and encouragement in the early days of the research
- Dr. T.V. Benn, who guided my first steps in bibliography
- the librarians, too numerous to mention by name, who generously offered the assistance of their knowledge and experience
- Gerda Hughes, who typed the text of the thesis with great accuracy and good humour
- Alason, Brigid, Eileen, Geraldine, Jan, Joan, John, and Lindsay, who assisted in the proof-reading
- Jim, who has helped in more ways than I could possibly say.

To all, my most sincere thanks.

Summary

The Life and works of Nicolas Lenglet-Dufresnoy, 1674-1755

This thesis endeavours to establish the facts concerning the life of the abbé Lenglet, based on archival, manuscript and printed evidence: his socio-economic background, his chequered 'political' career, his abortive attempts at integration into the church establishment, his many clashes with the royal administration and the resulting numerous periods of imprisonment. It shows how books were, from the early years, a major preoccupation in his life, whether as librarian and book-trader, or bibliographer, editor and author.

Having failed to secure a living through either state or church, the abbé's publishing activities became the principle, though never the sole preoccupation of his life. A documented study of the redaction and publication of each of Lenglet's works and editions, and the public response which greeted them, is complemented by a detailed analytical bibliography which adds to our understanding of the material conditions pertaining to the dissemination of ideas in the first half of the eighteenth century.

The thesis concludes that the abbé Lenglet's character was deeply marked by inconsistency, dishonesty and cynicism, and that these traits seriously affected the quality of his work. But, at the same time, he was an erudite and enterprising bibliographer, and he had a bold,

consistently critical, and sometimes original mind. Thanks to these latter qualities, coupled with an often foolhardy disregard for authority, he wrote or edited a number of important and influential works. In this he was actively helped and encouraged by more 'respectable' scholars, members of the robe class and close to the royal administration, who would not themselves risk any open association with the publication of 'subversive' material; their attitude to the abbé was highly ambiguous. He was also responsible for popularising, sometimes in a regrettably adulterated form, the works of greater writers. Though he lacked the ability of a major original author, he nonetheless made a significant contribution to the literature of the period. Moreover, the study of such a secondary figure adds a new, and perhaps indispensable dimension to our understanding of the social and intellectual climate of the eighteenth century.

List of abbreviated references to manuscript material frequently used
in the notes

Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol.	Archives du Ministère des affaires étrangères. Paris.
Arch. de la Guerre	Archives du Service historique de l'armée. Paris.
Bastille	Archives de la Bastille. Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal. Paris.
Franç.	Fonds français. Bibliothèque nationale, Dept. des manuscrits. Paris.
Minutier	Minutier central des notaires de Paris. Archives nationales. Paris.
Nouv.acq.franç.	Fonds français. Nouvelles acquisitions françaises. Bibliothèque nationale, Dept. des manuscrits. Paris.
Piancastelli	Collezione Piancastelli. Biblioteca comunale. Forli.
Staatsarchiv	Österreichisches Staatsarchiv. Vienna.
Vat.Lat.	MSS. Vaticana Latina. Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana. Rome.

INTRODUCTION

Nicolas Lenglet-Dufresnoy is a name now familiar only to literary historians who specialise in the study of the early eighteenth century in France. For them it is a name which crops up in all sorts of unlikely places: in relation to Voltaire's quarto Henriade; in studies on historiography in the period; it is known to the student of Spinoza's influence in France; it appears in the list of the early contributors to the Encyclopédie; most commonly the name still finds a place in contemporary criticism thanks to that strange treatise on the novel genre, De l'Usage des romans. Readers whose interest is sufficiently aroused by these encounters may consult a bibliographical manual, to find that the abbé Lenglet was in fact the author or editor of an astonishing quantity and variety of works, many of which were re-edited well into the nineteenth century.

When Lenglet has been recalled to the attention of the scholarly public, it has been largely as a 'champion of free thought';¹ his works have been sifted for unorthodox or subversive ideas, while the lengthy article on Lenglet's prison record published by Delort in his Histoire de la détention des philosophes et des gens de lettres à la Bastille, where the abbé figures alongside eminent contemporary 'persécutés' such as Fréret and Voltaire, served to strengthen an image which, at best, told only a partial truth. Such an approach to the study of writers who must be seen as second or third rate by the modern reader is tempting, for it allows a large body of turgid and boring material to be left in the shades of oblivion, the better to dwell on those few nuggets which might seem to be important in terms of the history of ideas. It follows

from a tradition which has seen cultural history in terms of the 'greats', and has used the works of a Bayle, a Voltaire or a Diderot as a rule of judgement by which the ideas, attitudes or actions of other, lesser writers are classified. This selectivity in the treatment of the works of secondary writers, the propensity to dwell only on that which is self-evidently related to pre-established areas of interest, creates a kind of inverse mechanism whereby our knowledge of the major writers, and consequently of the real intellectual and social climate of a period, is falsified. In reaction against this tradition Werner Krauss raised an essential question:

L'Histoire littéraire ne peut-elle se concevoir qu'en fonction de l'interprétation des grands maîtres, ou bien doit-elle embrasser la totalité des réalisations et des aspirations d'une époque? ²

The former approach also undervalued another significant facet of the literary experience, for as Daniel Mornet so often underlined:

On peut trouver dans des oeuvres médiocres et oubliées l'image de ce qui a paru aux contemporains non pas médiocre mais essentiel et qui ne se retrouve pas ou se trouve à peine dans les chefs-d'oeuvre. A travers les écrivains de troisième ou quatrième rayon on fait ainsi l'histoire de ces courants de l'opinion et du goût qu'on risque de méconnaître si l'on s'en tient aux chefs-d'oeuvre et sans lesquels parfois on comprend mal des chefs-d'oeuvre. ³

To ignore the judgements of contemporaries on figures such as Lenglet-Dufresnoy may lead us seriously to misinterpret their reactions to other writers on whom posterity has conferred the honour of recognition.

But the study of the lower ranks of writers poses its own methodological problems. On the one hand, as Mornet emphasised, their importance lies partly in representing the values of their intellectual and social milieu, and he warned against adopting too narrow a perspective in the study of a secondary writer; ⁴ on the other hand, the 'minutiae' of biographical data, which can enable us to grasp the social and economic background of an author, often assume a greater significance in the

study of secondary than of major writers, for great works are, of their essence, those which transcend the conditions of their creation, while such conditions have often more tangibly left their mark on works which lack the indefinable quality of genius. The failure to take account of these factors can lead to premature and erroneous assertions about the significance of an oeuvre; they can be established only with a great deal of painstaking research among primary sources.

In the struggle to grasp the realities of the material conditions of the creation and dissemination of ideas, the advances made in recent years by the historians of the book-trade and by the science of material bibliography have been of immense value. These disciplines provide us with a new perspective, a way of grasping the complex process by which a writer reaches his public, and that web of cross-influences whose effect on the very nature of the works, without lapsing into crudely materialistic interpretations, must not be underestimated.

Nicolas Lenglet-Dufresnoy is a writer who has been frequently misinterpreted because he has been under-researched; the very multiplicity of his activities has lent itself to a number of these deformations, and has no doubt been partly responsible for the reluctance to look beyond the expression of certain 'philosophic' ideas which could be easily isolated and categorised. This thesis endeavours to establish the facts concerning the life and work of this elusive abbé, in the conviction that this activity is a necessary and useful contribution to the study of the early Enlightenment, for which 'l'heure des synthèses n'a pas encore sonné.'⁵ It aims to provide all the documentary evidence available concerning the conception, redaction and publication of Lenglet's works, as well as the responses of contemporaries to those

works. The analytic study of the printed books is an essential element in this process, and the bibliography was conceived of as an integral part of, not an addendum to the thesis. The complementary nature of the two types of information which I have recorded, and which offer countless possibilities for exploitation, is highlighted in an Appendix devoted to the censorship of Lenglet's Méthode pour étudier l'histoire. Finally, through the detailed study of the abbé's chequered political and literary career I hope to cast new light on many aspects of his oeuvre, and add to our knowledge of the socio-economic status of the many such fortuneless abbés who haunted the publishing-houses of the period.

It is clear that a number of the abbé's works merit individual attention, and it is hoped that interpretative and evaluative studies based on these works will develop from the research recorded here. Until they can be completed it would be premature to offer wide-ranging conclusions on the abbé's intellectual contribution to the Enlightenment, and such conclusions must remain outside the scope of this thesis; but I hope I can assert that future interpretations will be both more accurate and more subtle as a result of this research.

*

*

*

Since the presentation of source material, much of it hitherto unpublished, is an important element in this thesis, I have chosen not to modernise the spelling or punctuation of quotations either in the text or the notes.

Notes to Introduction

1. See, for example, Lester Segal, 'Lenglet Du Fresnoy; the treason of a cleric in eighteenth-century France', Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, cxvi, 251-79.
2. W. Krauss, 'L'Etude des écrivains obscurs du siècle des lumières', Ibid., xxvi, p.1020.
3. D. Mornet, 'Comment étudier les écrivains ou les ouvrages de troisième ou de quatrième ordre', Romanic Review, xxviii(1937), p.205.
4. Ibid., pp.214-6.
5. W. Krauss, op.cit., p.1024.

CHAPTER I

1674-1704Family background

Nicolas Lenglet was born in Paris on the 5th October 1674 and baptized the following day in Saint-Eustache, parish church to both the Halles and the aristocratic Marais.¹

His father, Michel Lenglet,² was a wigmaker from Beauvais;³ the handsome dowry and advantageous marriages of his two daughters⁴ indicate that he was no simple salaried artisan, but rather a reasonably affluent maître-marchand.⁵ Certainly the name Lenglet figured large among the wealthy merchant families of Beauvais.⁶ The only information we have about him is contained in the following paragraph from a nineteenth century work of local erudition:

Son père était un perruquier de Beauvais, dont la maison servait de rendez-vous aux savans et aux beaux esprits de la ville. (Note: Le père de l'abbé Lenglet était originaire de Grand-Fresnoy, village dont notre abbé prit bravement le nom. Il demeurait sur la grand place, à l'endroit où est maintenant l'Hôtel-de-Ville.) Parmi les nombreux enfans de ce digne homme, tous spirituels comme lui, le petit Nicolas brillait par sa vivacité et son aptitude aux lettres.⁷

It is unfortunate that the author gave no further details about the literary circle meeting at the house where Nicolas spent his childhood.

His mother, Jeanne Houlon, was born around 1641;⁸ her son claimed she was a close relative of François Pidou de Saint-Olon who won fame as Louis XIV's envoy to Genoa and Morocco,⁹ and our abbé used 'de Saint Olon' as a pseudonym in his correspondence in later life.¹⁰ She too was a native of Beauvais where she spent her married life. The fact that she went to Paris to await the birth

of her son lends some weight to Lenglet's claim, as it is unlikely she would have done so had she not had family resident in the capital.¹¹ Perhaps she hoped to give the child influential godparents; but family connections play little role in Lenglet's subsequent Parisian career.

In later life the writer Nicolas Lenglet extended his patronymic by the addition of Dufresnoy; it has been suggested he did so because his family originally came from Grandfresnoy between Clermont and Compiègne.¹² There is no reliable proof of these origins, and Fresnoy is a common place name in the region (Fresnoy means 'pays planté de fresnes'). But in the absence of any indication that he could lay legitimate claim to a nom de terre it is likely that the gratuitous particule was suggested to him by some such family link, and its adoption was due largely to the common ambition to have some appearance of nobility.¹³ In this Lenglet was emulated by his two brothers.

Although information on the Lenglet parents is scant, we have some idea of the socio-economic position of the family thanks to the fact that Nicolas' known brothers and sisters, with only one exception, inevitably fell foul of the Administration at some stage in their chequered careers, thus finding their way into the files of the Parisian police.

Nicolas was followed by another son, Antoine, born c.1680.¹⁴ He was the black sheep of the family from his early days; destined for the church like his elder brother, he was expelled from the seminary in Beauvais before ordination. He retired to a Carthusian monastery where he spent eight months, moving on to the Trappists for a record four months; at this point he seems to have abandoned any aspirations to making his way in the religious world, as he was arrested in Nantes for stealing some silver cups and imprisoned for nine months. Having returned to Beauvais it is claimed he twice tried

to poison his mother. In 1723 he stole 28,000 livres from the Greffe de Beauvais, was picked up by the police in Paris and taken to Fort l'Evêque. His behaviour there was such that the Governor requested he be moved elsewhere; he was extremely dangerous and a cause of perpetual disorder. When his family was consulted as to what should be done with him they agreed that he should be detained in the Hôpital de Bicêtre where they would pay his board. In 1729 when the Lieutenant Général de Police proposed to release him Nicolas wrote back asking for a lettre de cachet to have his brother detained in the establishment of the Frères des Ecoles Chrétiennes at St. Yon de Rouen, again at the family's expense. He claimed they had 'ruined themselves' to repay the sum he had stolen and to stifle the affair in Beauvais; it was imperative that Antoine be prevented from causing them any more trouble. Their request was granted, but of course he soon escaped again, and having given much further proof of his dissolute ways he was finally arrested in 1732 at the request of the family. By this time he had adopted the appellation 'abbé Lenglet de Courcelles'. He appears to have finished his days in the Château de Ham, a prison in Picardy.¹⁵ Needless to remark his brother Nicolas was thoroughly ashamed of him and never mentioned him in his writings or correspondence.

A sister, Marguerite, born sometime before 1690, contracted in 1719 a highly advantageous marriage with Urbain de la Barre, son of an opulent 'Marchand Bourgeois de Paris'; he had for some time been an associate of her brother Nicolas and was probably a friend of the family in Beauvais. While serving actively as a Lieutenant de la Connétablie he bought and sold civil offices until he had improved his position from that of Auditeur des Comptes in 1719¹⁶ to Maître des Comptes at his death in 1737, having also held the charge of Trésorier Général des Invalides for a brief period around 1728.¹⁷ This rise from the upper bourgeoisie into the ranks of the

minor robe follows a pattern typical of the period. At the time of their marriage Urbain already had a solid fortune of more than 150,000 livres, to which was added Marguerite's sizable dowry of over 20,000 livres.¹⁸ This fortune places the young couple at the upper economic limit of the class of non-noble officers at the outset of their careers.¹⁹ Their wealth increased steadily throughout their married life, thanks partly, no doubt, to the services Urbain rendered to Claude Le Blanc, Ministre de la Guerre.²⁰ When his estate was divided between his wife and his niece it totalled 440,000 livres, of which almost 120,000 livres fell to the lot of Marguerite thanks to a 'don mutuel' constituted between herself and her husband: a sum vastly superior to the dowry she originally brought with her. Her inheritance included a 'maison seigneuriale et ferme de Cerzay' in the environs of Paris, which her husband bought at the time of their marriage.²¹ As she had no children she used her wealth to buy an entrance into the old provincial nobility for her brother Jacques' daughter, who took the name 'de Cerzay' and was married to an Angevin, Louis-Henry de Mailly Baron de Montejean.²² So, in the space of two generations one branch of the Lenglet family moved from the bourgeois master-tradesman class into the established nobility.

Nicolas retained a close contact with his affluent sister and brother-in-law throughout his life. It is interesting to note that from the time of their marriage they were themselves closely connected with the Academic circles which were to figure large in Nicolas' life: the two witnesses cited in their marriage contract, l'abbé Nadal and Piganiol de la Force, were members of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres.²³

Jacques Lenglet de Percel was mentioned only once in his brother's works: in the Histoire de la philosophie hermétique he is reported as having

dabbled in alchemy in association with a famous eighteenth-century alchemist called Aluys; Nicolas even claimed that he had succeeded in turning 14 ounces of mercury into gold!²⁴ Jacques appears to have been something of an adventurer; he emigrated to Brussels around 1720,²⁵ and a letter which Nicolas wrote from his prison in 1726 would suggest that both brothers had been working for the Secrétaire d'Etat Le Blanc, and were implicated in his downfall.²⁶ Jacques may well have been involved in some kind of spying activities which took him to the Netherlands, like Nicolas before him, and having fallen foul of the French administration found it preferable to remain there. One can surmise that he had no personal fortune;²⁷ and certainly the origin of the particule 'de Percel' is as obscure as the Dufresnoy and De Courcelles arrogated by his brothers. It probably had no more substantiality than the appellations 'Bourgeois de Paris' and 'Ecuyer' variously attributed to him in papers relating to his daughter's marriage.²⁸ Besides his alchemical activities he was part-author of a book entitled Les Annales du monde, ou l'histoire universelle published in Brussels in 1732.²⁹ We have no further indications as to what his activities in Brussels were, nor where his source of income lay, except for one mention of him in the correspondence of Jean-Baptiste Rousseau; the poet, who was living in exile in that city in 1731, and was involved in a bitter quarrel with Nicolas, wrote of de Percel as:

Un petit faquin de cette ville qui s'y est marié très bassement depuis quelques années et qu'on dit être le frère de cet indigne prêtre. Je n'ai garde de le connaître, car il n'est pas à portée de se présenter dans aucune bonne maison.³⁰

The woman Jacques married was a certain Marie Johnstone;³¹ although Nicolas mentions the existence of children in the plural,³² only one child, Anne Thérèse, comes forward to claim her uncle's succession in 1755. At this time she was still a minor; her father had already died and she and her mother were resident in Paris with Madame de la Barre.³³

Jacques did however return to France at least once; in June 1735 he was arrested in Paris because of an association with two young men who had stolen jewels in London. He obviously shared Nicolas' taste for intrigue, for on his arrest a letter from a 'Seigneur italien, pensionnaire de l'Empereur' was found hidden in a false bottom to his trunk; it was addressed to an Italian personage at Versailles and contained some elaborate scheme for patrolling the French frontiers. So de Percel was held as a spy in Fort l'Evêque for a couple of months. His brother Nicolas wrote anonymously a 'Mémoire' in his defence and sent it to the Lieutenant de Police; the name Lenglet does not appear anywhere in the documents relating to this arrest, for Jacques still did not want his true identity to be known in France.³⁴ No doubt Nicolas visited his brother's family on the occasions of his trips to the Netherlands; he too adopted 'de Percel' as a pseudonym in 1733.

Lastly there was a second sister, Marie Jeanne, who seems to have lived a relatively quiet and uneventful life. One must assume that she too received a sizable dowry from her family, for she married an 'Avocat au Parlement'.³⁵ She had one daughter, Marie Thérèse, who married a certain Jean Alexandre Thomas, holder of the minor civil office of 'commissaire juré, mouleur de bois'; he and his wife make an appearance in 1755 to claim the succession of her uncle Nicolas.³⁶

It seems therefore that the family into which Nicolas Lenglet-Dufresnoy was born was that of a master wigmaker with a solid, though not a great fortune. This fortune was devoted in the main to dowering the daughters so that they could marry into the higher social group of the 'officiers civils'; the charges of 'Avocat au Parlement' and 'Auditeur des Comptes' carried with them the 'noblesse au premier degré'.³⁷ It was undoubtedly

hoped that the sons, having been properly educated, could make successful careers for themselves. The way of advancement through the church was open to Antoine and Nicolas; they each spoilt their chances, though in very different manners. Likewise Jacques, as we have seen, had probably worked for a Minister, but ended his life in exile. No-one opted for the solid respectability of the provincial master-tradesman; their social ambitions, or perhaps those of their father, lay outside the stability of the 'family business'. All three of them have in common that they died penniless.³⁸

Formative years: the lure of print

Lenglet received his early education in his native city; up to the early 1690's he studied the humanités at the Collège de Beauvais, probably as an external pupil as his parents lived nearby.³⁹ This College, which was highly conservative in its teaching, was run by secular clergy; the students were nurtured almost entirely on the classics and traditional religious history.⁴⁰ The only modern books admitted to the library were those of the ecclesiastical writers, Bourdaloue, Bossuet, Massillon.⁴¹ The patron bishops were particularly interested in recruiting from the College 'des sujets pour le saint ministère'.⁴² Unlike the contemporary Oratorian colleges the curriculum took no account of modern scholarship nor of the rising critical movement.

However, the young Lenglet undoubtedly had access to a wider selection of reading-matter outside the school, and was exposed to other influences, through the literary circle meeting at his father's house. One of his rare reminiscences, in his later days, concerns a book written by a fellow

beauvaisien and published in 1688; the remark is reported by Dreux du Radier:

Le livre de Baillet sur les Enfants célèbres, et Auteurs avant leur majorité, étant tombé entre ses mains, il le lut avec avidité. Cet ouvrage augmenta dans le jeune lecteur la passion déjà fort vive qu'il avait pour les Belles-Lettres; il conçut dès lors le dessein de devenir Auteur; rien ne lui paraissait si beau que d'avoir fait un livre.⁴³

An ambition which may have pleased his family, but which would not have been lightly fostered by his grave clerical masters!

On the other hand, Lenglet's days at the College must have been marked by the Jansenist controversies raging in Beauvais in the latter part of the seventeenth century;⁴⁴ his interest in the Jansenist question, both religious and political, was to feature strongly throughout his life; Jansenism had been firmly implanted in Beauvais during the episcopate of Nicolas Choart de Buzanval⁴⁵ and had been taught in the College; it was for this reason that the Solitaires of Port-Royal sent the young Racine there as a boarder from 1652-1655.⁴⁶ When Buzanval died in 1679 it was hoped that Bossuet, at this time a collaborator of the Port-Royal group, would succeed him;⁴⁷ but it was Toussaint de Forbin Janson, a firm anti-Jansenist, who finally got the appointment. He tried to bring the 'herétiques' of his diocese into submission, especially in the Seminary and College, but was forced into a more concessionary attitude.⁴⁸ The opposition must have been still at a pitch when Nicolas entered the College in the mid 1680's; one wonders if this experience was at the origins of his taste for public controversy and political pamphleteering.

At about the age of eighteen Lenglet left his native city to continue his studies in the metropolis.⁴⁹ No doubt his parents felt he would be given a better preparation for the studies in Theology to which he was destined; in any case every student wishing to enter the Colleges of Sorbonne or

Navarre was obliged to spend two years in one of the lower colleges attached to the University of Paris where he would take his exams in Philosophie and accede to the degree of Maître ès Arts.⁵⁰ The obvious choice for Nicolas was the Collège de Dormans-Beauvais, one of the best of the 'Collèges de plein exercice', situated between the rue Jean-de-Beauvais and the rue des Carmes. Among its recent ex-pupils it could count Nicolas Boileau-Despreaux, Charles Perrault, Antoine Arnauld and Antoine Le Maître de Saci. Unfortunately, its renown had somewhat declined under the principalship of Nicolas Boutillier (1677-1697), a rather insignificant personage.⁵¹ Discipline, it appears, was very lax: the pupils could slip off into the Latin Quarter whenever they wanted by bribing the gateman of the rue des Carmes.⁵² Nevertheless its academic reputation was upheld by Jean Vittement who held the Chaire de Philosophie under Boutillier; his reputation was such that he was appointed to teach Louvois' son, and later the royal grandchildren.⁵³ It was undoubtedly under his tutorship that Lenglet prepared to take the degree of Maître ès Arts, which he had acquired by 1694.

In that year he entered the Collège de Sorbonne, not as a fee-paying pensionnaire, but as a domestic⁵⁴ in the service of Edme Pirot, Docteur de la Maison de Sorbonne, and one of the best-known theologians of the day.⁵⁵ He embarked on what was normally a seven-year programme of study leading to the degree of Licentié en Théologie.⁵⁶ The aspirant to this degree was obliged to pass through an extremely complex series of examinations and theses: the principal ones were the Tentative, which was normally passed within four years and conferred the title of Bachelier en Théologie, the Mineure, the Majeure and the Sorbonnique which eventually led him to the Licence. Most of the exercises were oral in form: the candidate was questioned by anything from four to ten Doctors, and in most cases their

approbation had to be unanimous for him to pass. These interrogations were also extraordinarily lengthy; the Sorbonnique continued from six a.m. to six p.m. - certainly a test of endurance if not of scholarship!

Although the Faculty was by this time largely moving away from the old scholastic theology to what they called 'théologie positive', that is 'la simple connaissance ou exposition des dogmes et des articles de foi, autant qu'ils sont contenus dans les saintes Ecritures, ou expliqués par les pères et les conciles, dégagées de toutes disputes et controverses',⁵⁷ Lenglet does not speak any the more favourably of the education it afforded him. He makes several remarks on the subject in his edition of the works of Marot of which the following note on the Faculty in the sixteenth century is typical:

On ne s'y appliquois alors qu'à une mauvaise Theologie, pleine de questions extravagantes, comme on le peut voir par les [é]crits de ces temps-là, et même par François Rabelais qui s'en est moqué très-agréablement. Il y a eu depuis quelque changement: mais il est à craindre que la Sorbonne ne retombe dans cet abîme, tant les études y sont devenues seches et stériles.⁵⁸

To which one might add the witness of Lenglet's 'compatriot' the abbé Du Bos who passed through the Sorbonne some four years earlier:

Il n'i a plus que ceux qui ont envie de passer bachelier en théologie, qui aprennent la chicane, à cause de certains vieux barbons de docteurs, par les mains de qui il faut passer.⁵⁹

But if the course-work did not interest him, Lenglet was not long in finding other outlets for his energies. He tells us in his Traité sur les apparitions that as a young student he used to visit Bossuet;⁶⁰ it is likely that Pirot, who was a supporter of Bossuet in the Quietist quarrel, recommended his protégé to the great prelate. In his country residence at Germigny, Bossuet frequently received scholars and writers who discussed history, philosophy and erudition with him. Lenglet was no doubt highly flattered to be admitted along with men of such established reputation as the orientalist Renaudot, Herbelot, Antoine Galland, and the abbé Fleury who became a member of the

Académie Française in 1696.⁶¹ It was from Bossuet himself that Lenglet learnt the story of the mystic, Madame Guyon, which he recounts in the Traité sur les apparitions.⁶² It was possibly a conversation in the Bossuet circle which encouraged the young man to embark on his publishing career in the second year of his theology course.

In 1695 Thomas Croset, a Recollect priest, published a French translation of the life of the Virgin Mary by Marie Coronel, called Marie de Jésus in religion, from the convent of Agréda in Castille.⁶³ She claimed to have written her book under the direction of the Blessed Virgin who favoured her with innumerable visions and revelations. Soon after the appearance of the Spanish edition in Madrid in 1670, it was condemned by the Roman inquisition, but the Papal interdiction remained a dead letter owing to the intervention of the Spanish court: Philip IV had kept up a regular correspondence with Marie for twenty-two years.⁶⁴ The French edition when it appeared carried many approbations, two of them by Docteurs de Sorbonne. Bossuet immediately reacted against the book, reiterating his determination to oppose all 'nouveau-tés', especially in a form 'qui tourne si visiblement à l'opprobre et au scandale de la religion'.⁶⁵ Since the Quietist affair was already in the air, Bossuet was anxious to seize such a chance of denouncing visionaries and mystics who sought to supersede church scriptures and traditions. The book, in fact, purported to recount the life of the Virgin and of her son in the most intimate details from the moment of their conception; some of its colourful passages recounted that Mary was born after a gestation period of seven days, being about the size of a bee; that she shed tears in her mother's womb to deplore human sin; that she could talk from the time of birth though she did not like to do so in public, etc. The innumerable extravagances were intermingled with passages of scholastic theology in the Scotist vein (Marie d'Agréda was a Franciscan nun). Bossuet

and the Cardinal de Noailles referred the volume to the Faculty of Theology on 2nd May, 1696, insisting that action must be taken against the two doctors who had approved the book.⁶⁶ The Faculty nominated four of its members to carry out a preliminary examination. There followed a long and involved debate which divided the Docteurs de Sorbonne: there were 32 sessions held on the subject in which the discussion was often more than heated.⁶⁷ Pamphlets for and against Marie d'Agréda proliferated, and it was as a contribution to this controversy that Lenglet's first work was written. Thanks to the procès-verbal of Lenglet's interrogation by the Lieutenant Général de Police in August we have a detailed account of the circumstances surrounding the event.⁶⁸

Edme Pirot, one of those Doctors most often charged with the examination of books referred to the Faculty, had been given or procured a copy of the Mystique Cité de Dieu. Since there was a shortage of copies, the book having already been suppressed by order of the Chancellor,⁶⁹ he charged his young domestic Nicolas with copying it out twice by hand. But Lenglet, a far from docile acolyte with a nose for 'hot' subjects, was tempted to go beyond his brief and publish a commentary of his own on the work. He had the two major advantages of easy access to the book itself, and first-hand knowledge of what was going on in the Sorbonne; as he admitted to M. le Lieutenant de Police:

A dit qu'il n'a point été présent et qu'il n'a point entendu ce qui a esté dit dans ladite assemblée de la faculté lorsqu'on y a parlé du livre de la Religieuse d'Agréda, mais qu'a la fin de chaque assemblée plusieurs amis dudit Sr Pirot le venant voir, et luy disant ordinairement ce qui s'était passé en chacune desdites assemblées de la faculté, luy respondant s'y rendait attentif.⁷⁰

He published his Lettre à Messieurs les Doyen, Syndic et Docteurs en Théologie de la Faculté de Paris anonymously around the end of June.⁷¹ The findings of the four Docteurs had not yet appeared; Lenglet's was the first major public statement on the matter in hand.⁷²

He makes three main points in his pamphlet. Firstly, he states that the Church has a Canon of sacred writings which are the foundation of the Catholic faith, and he adds 'l'Eglise est persuadée qu'il ne se fait plus maintenant de nouvelles révélations';⁷³ therefore Marie's claim that her writings were directly inspired by God is preposterous and unacceptable. He goes on to parallel certain statements made by the prophets with those made by Marie d'Agréda, clearly implying, in a highly ironic tone, that here, at least, are false and derivative:

Qu'on examine toute cette conduite, et on verra que si elle ne s'élève pas en tout au-dessus des Prophetes, veut-elle au moins qu'ils ne la surpassent en rien; elle reçoit comme eux un commandement exprès d'écrire ce que Dieu lui dicterait. Isaïe se trouvait heureux d'avoir eu les lèvres purifiées par le feu, mais la sainteté de notre Prophetesse va bien plus loin, puis qu'on ne reconnoît plus en elle aucun reste des enfans d'Adam. Jérémie poussé par l'impiété de son Prince, brûle ses Propheties; Dieu lui commande: il écrit de nouveau, mais avec une si grande rapidité, que la plume alloit avec autant de vitesse que s'il lisoit. Qu'y a-t-il de différent entre Jérémie et notre Prophetesse; que c'est l'ingratitude d'un Prince qui fit brûler les Ecrits de Jérémie, et que c'est un Confesseur qui ne connoissoit pas la Religieuse, qui lui fit brûler ses Ouvrages, puisque la seconde fois qu'elle écrivit, la légèreté de sa plume ne suffisoit pas, et qu'elle fut obligée de passer beaucoup de choses?⁷⁴

Lenglet concludes this section by remarking on the scandal given to free-thinkers and Protestants by such works. He argues convincingly:

Quel jugement crofez-vous que les Libertins porteront de l'Ecriture et du fond de toute nôtre Religion, lors qu'ils verront qu'on égale à ces saints Livres des visions tout-à-fait chimériques; n'auront-ils pas raison de rejeter nôtre Ecriture Canonique, lors qu'ils voient qu'on veut faire passer pour inspiré un livre dont toute la beauté consiste dans un effort d'imagination? Ils pourront dire avec seureté 'Allons, faisons nous-mêmes une nouvelle Ecriture; donnons l'essor à nôtre esprit, et opposons aux folies qu'on veut nous faire recevoir une sagesse qui sera nôtre propre travail'.⁷⁵

In his second section Lenglet holds that the Mysteries of Religion must be protected against the extravagances of 'un esprit visionnaire et fanatique':⁷⁶ one example is Marie's contention that the Virgin was assumed into heaven at the same time as Christ, but a replica of herself remained on earth so that the faithful should not be too astounded. Lenglet comments:

Nos freres errans n'ont-ils point déjà assez de peine à captiver leur entendement et à se soumettre à la Foi qui nous enseigne que Jesus-Christ se trouve en différens lieux par le Sacrifice de la Messe? Faut-il augmenter leur doute de jour en jour, et leur donner encore plus d'éloignement de l'Eglise Romaine? On peut voir les railleries qu'ils ont fait sur un sujet semblable. Il y a comme vous le sçavez, Messieurs, une dispute entre plusieurs Eglises sur le Saint Suaire qu'elles veulent toutes posséder, quoi qu'il ne puisse y en avoir qu'un; mais, nous disent nos Freres Errans en se mocquant de Nous, il n'y a qu'à appliquer ici le principe de la reproduction. (M. Baile dans les Nouvelles de la Republ. des Lettres).⁷⁷

The last section points to morally reprehensible descriptions of sexual relations between the Virgin's parents, and the author remarks that many of Marie's assertions are no less imaginative than the old Romance tales, only worthy of 'un cerveau un peu affaibli'!⁷⁸ He concludes:

Nous sommes venus au Siècle qui avait été annoncé, où les hommes abandonnant la saine Doctrine, s'attachent aux Fables et aux Visions chimériques, et que s'étant éloignez de la charité et de la véritable Foi, ils sont tombez dans le phanatisme.⁷⁹

In making such a sweeping statement as that the Church no longer accepts the possibility of revelations, Lenglet totally disregards the public acclaim accorded by Roman Catholicism to the visions and revelations of canonised saints such as Teresa of Avila and Brigid. This was shortly to be pointed out by Père Clouzeil in his reply, who rightly asks: 'de quelle Eglise il parle... Est-ce de l'Eglise Protestante?'⁸⁰ There is a certain ambiguity in the passages where Lenglet parallels Marie's statements and those of the prophets: the obvious implication is that Marie has 'borrowed' from Scripture, but the ridicule cast on her inevitably rubs off on the scriptural text itself. Whether this is intentional on the part of the author is not altogether clear at this stage, but the use of similar techniques in his Traité sur les apparitions which was largely written the following year though left unpublished until 1751, would suggest that the ambiguity is inseparable from a basic scepticism towards the supernatural.⁸¹

The degree to which the new wave of rationalistic, and even of textual criticism has influenced the young Lenglet is striking; his pamphlet betrays

a sympathetic response to freethinking and protestant critiques of Catholic dogma which ill befit a second-year theology student. One must remember that Bayle's Dictionnaire historique et critique⁸² was not to appear for another year yet, but the obvious admiration for the exiled philosopher expressed here shows that the ground was already well prepared for its arrival, and its message would not fall on deaf ears. The pamphlet thus bears witness to the breadth of Nicolas' reading: the elements of textual criticism in this, and in the Traité sur les apparitions written shortly afterwards, would suggest that he was also familiar with the controversial biblical exegesis of the ex-Oratorian Richard Simon. Some few years later this influence on the young Lenglet's work was clearly perceived and noted by the Jesuits in a review of his Novum Testamentum.⁸³ The conclusion reached by Robert R. Palmer about the first half of the eighteenth century is undoubtedly true of this earlier period:

The professors and students in the best theological schools were not so isolated from the world as their enemies the philosophes would have us believe. They were often aware of what was happening, and knew that the critical methods made popular by Bayle struck very deep. The result, for them, was much perplexity of mind.⁸⁴

The degree of perplexity would appear to be somewhat reduced in Lenglet's case; his acceptance of the critical method is wholehearted, and is accompanied by a freshness and enthusiasm which would be lost in the cynicism of his later works. Indeed, the tone of the pamphlet testifies to an extraordinary degree of self-assurance on the part of the student in the expression of his ideas. In itself the repetition of the term 'fanatisme' three times in the space of some twenty pages would indicate that a certain kind of 'lumière' was penetrating into the Sorbonne over half a century before the abbé de Prades presented his thesis. There can be no doubt that the pamphlet was well received by a number of well-known Docteurs de Sorbonne, who advised the young man in the conduct of the affair.⁸⁵ His later success in his Licence also proves that no lasting opprobrium had been attached to him.⁸⁶ Its

reception by the wider public was, nevertheless, mixed; on his own admission 'quelques personnes croient que l'on a poussé trop fort le Livre de la Religieuse'.⁸⁷ The Franciscan party was preparing its reply,⁸⁸ mainly because the pamphlet had been attributed by many people to the famous Dominican theologian Chaussemer, one of those nominated by the Faculty to report on the book, a fact which was highly flattering to the young student.⁸⁹ This encouraged him to publish a second, shorter piece two weeks later.

The Abrégé des disputes causées à l'occasion du livre qui a pour titre, La Mystique Cité de Dieu, La Vie de la Vierge, etc.⁹⁰ states that his object is to unite the two sides, and certainly the language is moderate in comparison with the first publication. However, in his brief summary of Marie d'Agréda's life and account of the dispute up to that time he obviously wishes to highlight the self-interested role played by the Franciscan order in the whole affair. Firstly, he points out that although Marie may have written the book, she was directed throughout, on her own admission, by her superiors and a number of theologians. Nevertheless, the accusation that it was dictated to her by a Franciscan priest remains veiled; it was only in the Traité sur les apparitions that he dared to state it openly, showing how many passages had been taken directly from scholastic writers.⁹¹ Secondly, he shows up the political pressure brought to bear by the Order in Spain and in Rome to prevent the suppression of the book; the precise factual details he reports succeed in making this evident without betraying any clearly polemical intention on his part. Whereas the first pamphlet dealt with Marie d'Agréda from the dogmatic point of view, this one makes clear the extent to which dogmatic and political considerations are interrelated in the Sorbonne's discussion of the Agréda book and therefore further serves to 'demystify' the whole affair.

For a few weeks Lenglet watched the development of the dispute, and, as we shall see, set about distributing his pamphlets as best he could. But this exciting period was brought to an end one day in August when his master Pirot stormed into his room, found several hundred copies of the second pamphlet there and carried them off to the Lieutenant Général de Police. Lenglet was arrested 'de l'ordre du Roy' on 17th August and escorted to the hôtel of Gabriel Nicolas de la Reynie where he was questioned. From thence he was apparently taken to the Bastille, where he was left to ponder on his transgressions for three days before being brought back to the Lieutenant Général.⁹²

The text of the interrogations casts an interesting light on underground printing activities in the late seventeenth century, a period which probably saw the strictest censorship in the history of the Ancien Régime,⁹³ and on the young cleric's relationship with his master. When questioned by M. de la Reynie, Lenglet confessed that the Lettre à MM. les Doyen had been printed by 'le nommé Terrat, garçon libraire de la Veufve Chastelain'.⁹⁴ The police paid a visit to Terrat and seized nearly 400 copies of the work⁹⁵ of which one was shown to the author for identification during the second interrogation. Lenglet then recounted how he knew Terrat, having bought books from him on several occasions; he brought along his manuscript one day, and Terrat agreed to have the work executed by an unnamed printer without the knowledge of the Veufve Chastelain. At this stage Nicolas did not admit to being the author of the pamphlet, 'sachant bien qu' un homme de son âge en se déclarant auteur ne pouvait demander aucun parti à des ouvrages de cette qualité';⁹⁶ and he promised Terrat he would bring him an 'approbation et privilège' before he had finished printing, which of course he could not acquire without risking discovery by Pirot. The bargain struck was that the edition would be to the sole profit of Terrat, but he would sell half of

the total of eight hundred copies to Lenglet at one sol a piece; the understanding was that the latter would not sell them on the open market, thus undercutting Terrat. When the time came Lenglet could afford to take only two hundred, and did not even pay for these in full; Terrat was not too happy at being left with the extra stock on his hands, and moreover suspected that Lenglet was in fact selling his copies to other libraires. This was probably true; Lenglet admits to the Lieutenant de Police that he gave copies to three libraires, Coustereau, Neuilly and Roüan, in payment for books they had given him on credit. He also states that he had given copies to a number of his friends, that some were sent anonymously to certain 'Docteurs', and that he had also sent several copies to his family in Beauvais.

Since Terrat was not too pleased with Lenglet's conduct, the student was obliged to contact another publisher in order to have the Abrégé des disputes printed. A libraire named Roüan came to see him at the Sorbonne one morning, Lenglet having informed him that his master being usually in class at that time he was free to transact his own business at his lodgings, and the manuscript was handed over. The work was given to be printed to a certain Langlais; Roüan and the author conspired to fool him into thinking the piece came from the pen of Edme Piro, thus forestalling his likely objections. The bargain struck was very similar to the agreement with Terrat: Lenglet would take four hundred copies for which he would pay 14 livres, the rest of the edition presumably to be divided between printer and libraire (its exact size is not stated). Of Lenglet's four hundred copies, eighteen went to Terrat, presumably in part payment of Lenglet's outstanding debt, twelve to Roüan, and eight were sent to his family in Beauvais. All the rest were seized by Piro on the fatal day he discovered what his domestic had been up to under his roof.

In typical eighteenth-century paternalistic style, M. de la Reynie lectured the young man on the great wrong he had done his master. Although he does call him to account for the subterfuge he used in having works printed illicitly without the royal approbation, and for deluding the printer, nevertheless his rebuke is not over-vehement, and he is obviously primarily interested in satisfying the Sr. Pirot from whom the complaint stemmed. Nothing is mentioned about the actual content of the pamphlets. The renowned theologian Pirot was more distressed by the breach of confidence and discipline on the part of his domestic than by the direction his ideas were taking; one must assume that these had not struck him as extraordinarily unorthodox.⁹⁷

The punishment meted out to Lenglet by the ecclesiastical authorities was not, in fact, particularly harsh: he was expelled from the 'Maison de Sorbonne' by Pirot⁹⁸ and had to find another place to live, but he was allowed to continue his studies in theology, probably after an interruption of a year or so.⁹⁹ J.-B. Michault stated that the first pamphlet was 'censurée en Sorbonne',¹⁰⁰ but there is no evidence to this effect even though the statement was repeated in a very recent article.¹⁰¹ It is probable that Lenglet's imprisonment was of very short duration, and was intended principally as a warning; the young 'theologian' no doubt enjoyed basking in his newly-founded reputation among his fellow-students and teachers.

That there was a public, however small, interested in the pamphlets is certain, for someone found it worthwhile to produce a second edition of both pieces; they were vastly superior in the quality of production to those of Terrat and Roüan, and they both came off the same printing-

presses.¹⁰² There was undoubtedly a succès de scandale consequent on the seizures, and the drastic reduction of the number of copies in circulation would have raised the demand at least among the Docteurs de Sorbonne . In what quantities they were printed, and whether they were published with or without the cooperation of the author is impossible to ascertain.

The information recorded here shows that Lenglet, even at this young age, was already establishing the life-style which would be his throughout his days: his interest in the book-trade was central to his activities, and, taking different forms, would largely dictate the contours of his career. In his frequentation of the librairies of the Latin Quarter he developed that knowledge of rare and interesting books which not only turned him into a bibliographer of extraordinary ability, but was also to bring him into contact with many persons of note in Europe. His determination to publish despite all legal and economic constraints would lead him into a life-long battle with the libraires on the one hand, the political administration on the other.

After his expulsion from the Maison de Sorbonne Lenglet and his family obviously had to find another place for him to live in Paris. They enrolled him in the Oratorian seminary of Saint-Magloire,¹⁰³ situated on the fringe of the city at the top of the rue Saint-Jacques. They may well have been influenced in their choice by the fact that the archbishop of Paris, Cardinal de Noailles, had made it obligatory from June of this year, 1696, for every young man wishing to be ordained a priest in his diocese to spend a total of fifteen months in one of the Parisian seminaries; up to this time priests did not necessarily have any training to fit them for their sacerdotal functions.¹⁰⁴ The mid-seventeenth century had seen the foundation of five institutions in Paris which aimed at remedying this situation,

though the pension was a major obstacle to many possible candidates: it amounted to about four hundred livres per annum.¹⁰⁵ Some poorer students could get scholarships, but it is unlikely that Lenglet fell into this category; his family had to pay these fees for the next few years.¹⁰⁶ No doubt they still hoped he would make a career in the church, and felt that the contacts he could make in the seminary would be useful to him, especially in one of those which retained an aristocratic character combined with the highest intellectual reputation. As Jeanne Ferté has pointed out in her study of religious life in the French countryside at this period:

Les séminaires de Saint-Sulpice et de Saint-Magloire, se recrutant dans un milieu cultivé qui semblait destiné à l'exercice des plus hautes charges dans l'Eglise, donnaient tous deux à leurs élèves une formation théologique et spirituelle de haute qualité, à laquelle s'employaient des maîtres de la plus grande valeur, dont la réputation s'étendait bien au-delà des murs du séminaire;¹⁰⁷

of the two Saint-Magloire was undoubtedly the best suited to Lenglet's independent character and to his interests. Here the students took part each day in a number of religious exercises and classes in theology and philosophy, but they were allowed many hours in which to pursue their studies in the seclusion of their rooms, as well as following their courses 'en Sorbonne'. The Sulpician rule, on the other hand, recommended that the ordinands should not be left in their rooms for more than an hour and a half!¹⁰⁸ The Oratorians, it was well known, were modern-minded men whose philosophy was cartesian and politics gallican; many of them had Jansenist leanings. In their schools French was spoken and great emphasis was put on critical scholarship in the study of subjects such as history and geography. A large number of the early eighteenth-century scholars in the Académie des Inscriptions, some of them future associates of Lenglet, were products of Oratorian schools or had been members of the Order: the Abbé Bignon, Fréret, Secousse, de Sainte-Palaye, not to mention Montesquieu himself.¹¹⁰ It is

not therefore surprising that a young man so evidently attracted by the critical movement should have opted for this particular seminary, nor that the fathers should have been willing to accept the young denouncer of mystical extravagances.

Soon after his expulsion from the Sorbonne Lenglet began to prepare another work on the question of Marie d'Agréda and the miraculous. In June 1697 he wrote to the superior of a Carmelite monastery in Madrid¹¹¹ to find out whether the nuns in the convent of Agréda could read Latin and therefore know the early church writings, or alternatively whether those writings had been translated into Spanish. The reply made it clear that the nuns were barely literate in their mother tongue, and that the writings in question had never been translated.¹¹² Lenglet then set out to prove in the work finally published under the title Traité historique et dogmatique sur les apparitions, les visions et les révélations particulières,¹¹³ that the supposed 'mysteries' revealed to Marie, and of which the early church was purportedly not worthy, were drawn from a fifth century apocryphal gospel by a Manichean called Seleucus, published under the title De nativitate sanctæ Mariæ; he quotes parallel passages from the two works which are in fact almost identical.¹¹⁴ He remarks sarcastically:

On conviendra que pour les proposer il ne fallait pas se mettre en frais d'Apparitions et de Révélations, puisqu'il y a plus de treize cens ans que Seleucus, chef d'une secte de Manichéens, les avait déjà fait connaître dans un faux Evangile.¹¹⁵

In a similar way he shows that many other passages in the Mystique Cité are drawn from the writings of theologians of the Franciscan order.¹¹⁶ Since he had already established more or less conclusively that Marie d'Agréda did not know Latin, his astute textual parallels prove that she was not the sole author of the book, and that many of its 'revelations' were not original.

The other ten chapters written at this time¹¹⁷ are devoted to a discussion

of the principles to be applied in the verification or rejection of visions and apparitions. They bear all the marks of a scholastic training; they are verbose and repetitious in the extreme. The argument is often confused, as is for example his attempt to establish a distinction between 'apparitions corporelles, spirituelles et intellectuelles'.¹¹⁸ The stylistic confusion mirrors an evident duality in the approach: vehement attacks on certain 'incrédules et austères Littérateurs',¹¹⁹ and professions of his own belief in miracles are more than counteracted by the implications of the greater part of the work.

Lenglet manages to cast doubt on miracles in two basic ways. Firstly, he states that the possibility of God's making revelations to individuals must be accepted, since those recorded in Scripture are the foundation of Catholic doctrine;¹²⁰ but modern apparitions can be regarded as true only if their message is in accordance with the established body of dogma.¹²¹ Supposedly miraculous events must be examined coolly by the 'rational' mind to ensure that they are not innovatory, the implication being that that which is outside the control of reason may lead mankind into the paths of error and fanaticism. This was a line of argument which was to be taken up in the later part of the eighteenth century by the orthodox Catholic theologians to justify their rejection of the Jansenist miracles;¹²² it is a circular argument whose corollary is, of course, that scripture and tradition are reinforced and 'proved' by all truly miraculous revelations. Lenglet cleverly uses this central weakness in the argument to imply that the number of such miracles is best kept to a minimum, to avoid raising any questions about the original body of revelation.¹²³

The Jesuits in 1751 may not have drawn the logical conclusion to this line of thought, but Lenglet in 1697 certainly did, and he repeatedly exploited

it in the text in statements such as the following:

Il est vrai que les révélations et les apparitions ont été quelquefois utiles à ceux qui les ont reçues; mais quel trouble n'ont-elles pas jetté aussi dans les consciences: on pourrait dire même qu'elles ont plus fait de tort qu'elles n'ont apporté d'utilité.¹²⁴

Such comments seriously call into question the wisdom of a Divine Providence which so wastes humanity's time, and could have been interpreted as verging on the blasphemous.

Secondly, by insisting on an examination of the 'historical' circumstances surrounding miracles or apparitions, he raises insurmountable doubts about almost all of those which he reports in his text, even while loudly professing to believe in them. Such is the case of the supposed apparitions of Christ and the Virgin to Saint Francis of Assisi when they granted him an Indulgence for his church.¹²⁵ Lenglet quotes a criticism of this tradition by a famous theologian, Jacques de Sainte-Beuve, which points out that no contemporary historian mentioned these events.¹²⁶ He then ostensibly rejects Sainte-Beuve's analysis, showing that the existence of the Indulgence in question is proven by the certificates of the Papal envoys of the time, and is therefore an historical fact; but it becomes clear that he in fact shares Sainte-Beuve's views about the supposed apparitions which accompanied the event.¹²⁷ Moreover his ironic attitude is betrayed by remarks such as the following:

Dieu ne cessait de combler et même d'accabler François de grâces et de faveurs extraordinaires.¹²⁸

In fact, Lenglet's real feelings on the matter are evident when one considers that this latter apparition, and innumerable others such as those of Saint Brigid in favour of the Immaculate Conception, and those of Saint Catherine of Siena against, are dealt with in two long chapters under the heading 'Des motifs et des intérêts qui ont fait inventer de fausses Apparitions et de fausses Révélations'.¹²⁹ He suggests that most miracles,

or the accounts of such, are suspiciously favourable to the ambition or personal interests of certain individuals or groups; the visions of even such celebrated saints as Teresa or Brigid inevitably confirm their own theology or that of their respective orders. This in itself must cast doubt on them, and one must carefully consider the circumstances surrounding such events. More often than not there is no proof in the form of contemporary independent witnesses, and therefore they should not be accepted. He concludes with a 'philosophic' flourish:

C'est donc souvent à ces illusions que conduit une piété, qui n'est pas éclairée. On prétend l'autoriser, non par les preuves ordinaires, qu'on ne croit pas suffisantes, mais on veut du merveilleux; l'on cherche des faits éclatans, qui frappent et qui persuadent: n'en trouve-t-on pas, on croit être en droit ou d'en imaginer, ou de se servir de ceux que la simplicité et la crédulité suggèrent. Cette méthode mise une fois en pratique par un seul homme, donne lieu à beaucoup d'autres d'en faire autant, et par là on se trouve rempli d'Apparitions et de Révélations chimériques; comme nous le sommes effectivement dans un grand nombre de livres.¹³⁰

The overall impression given by this text is therefore one of deep scepticism; the tone and the vocabulary, opposing 'la piété éclairée' to 'la crédulité', are clearly more outspoken in their modernism and rationalism than were the terms of Lenglet's first pamphlet. It is not surprising that Lenglet did not dare to publish it in 1697; in this he was advised by friends, and by 'ce que la Sorbone avait de plus habile et de plus éclairé'.¹³¹ Their number included Jean Gerbais,¹³² and probably his second master de Lestocq with whom he appears to have remained on good terms;¹³³ it is highly likely that he was also advised by his fellow-students and his directors at Saint-Magloire, who cannot have been unaware of his activities in the bosom of their highly sociable community.¹³⁴ Their advice to the young man was sound, for even in 1751 he had great difficulty in having his work passed by the French censorship authorities, and it was finally published in Avignon with a permission tacite only after Pope Benedict XIV had verbally approved it.¹³⁵ Even at that date, half a century later, the theologian Dom Calmet would be quick to point out the basically subversive nature of

Lenglet's treatise.¹³⁶

First directions in a literary career

But if he had to tuck this work away in his files, Lenglet soon found another outlet for his publishing aspirations as translator and editor of more orthodox books. Four such editions appeared between 1700 and 1705; they included the three books which Viatte tells us a young student was expected to bring with him on entering Saint-Magloire.¹³⁷ This is an early manifestation of Lenglet's keen sensitivity to the needs of diverse reading publics, which having identified he would be quick to fill with his own publications.

The first was the Imitation de Jésus-Christ, en forme de prières, pour tous les dimanches et principales fêtes de l'année, et pour les différents états de la vie,¹³⁸ which he apparently prepared in 1698 though it was not published until 1700.¹³⁹ It was a translation, by Lenglet, of selected passages from this highly popular devotional manual, and was the first to be arranged 'en forme de prières'.¹⁴⁰ He himself remarked that 'c'était la mode de ces livres';¹⁴¹ the latter part of the seventeenth century witnessed the climax of the Catholic Reformation in terms of publishing: innumerable editions of works of spirituality were turned out, especially in the form of translations accessible to a wide public. The Imitation was one of the works in greatest demand.¹⁴² The early biographers claim that this edition was reprinted three times,¹⁴³ but this cannot be substantiated.

In 1703 appeared the Novum Jesu-Christi Testamentum...Notis historicis et criticis illustratum, in two volumes in-24.¹⁴⁴ It was the first edition

with notes to appear in such a manageable format, and the journalists of both the Journal des savants and the Mémoires de Trévoux were highly complimentary about the organisation and lay-out of the material.¹⁴⁵

Lenglet's preface treated of the best way to approach the study of the New Testament. He recommended works on the history of the Jews, on chronology and geography which would enable the reader to place the gospel story in its historical context; accounts of the lives of the Evangelists would also, he felt, be a useful accompaniment. He piously recommended that the student should approach the text with a lively faith, Christian love and eager application; he stated that the Theologians are, of course, the proper interpreters of Scripture, and not the 'grammariens'. All his commentaries, he could assure the reader, are in accordance with Church tradition. In fact, however, the dominant approach in the notes is one of critical textual analysis, relying heavily on linguistic comparison with non-sacred contemporary writers, and historical information concerning Jewish and non-Jewish societies.

The review in the Journal des savants was definitely favourable. The critic was not unduly worried by the fact that Lenglet's notes 'sont tirées du sens grammatical du texte',¹⁴⁶ nor by his uninhibited description of 'des coutumes, dont on ne trouve des vestiges que dans le Paganisme, quand il a crû qu'elles pouvaient servir à son dessein'.¹⁴⁷ On the contrary, he praised the annotator's breadth of learning and the originality of certain of his notes. He concluded:

On espère que dans peu on verra paroître une Bible entière avec des notes du même Auteur pareilles à celles qu'on trouve icy sur le Nouveau Testament.¹⁴⁸

He could scarcely have been more flattering to the young seminarian.

The tone of the long article in the Mémoires de Trévoux was, however, very

different. The journalist was quick to underline the fact that many of the works of history and sacred chronology recommended by Lenglet came from the pen of Protestant writers. Likewise he reports in ironic italics Lenglet's recommendation of certain Jansenist writers:

Il assure qu'il [...] a tiré [ses notes] des meilleurs Commentaires; c'est à dire, comme il s'explique de la Concordance de Mr. Arnaud, et du Commentaire de Jansenius Evêque d'Ipres sur les Evangiles, où il veut qu'on puise la saine Theologie.¹⁴⁹

The Jesuit attacks him for adopting the methodology of Richard Simon and the grammariens :

Il serait à souhaiter qu'il eût toujours suivi la regle si sage qu'il avait établi dans sa Preface, et qu'il eût cherché dans la tradition et dans les Ecrits des Peres, le sens des passages difficiles. Il s'est reconcilié quelquefois avec la Grammaire.¹⁵⁰

In addition, the reviewer criticises in strong terms the doctrinal content of many of Lenglet's footnotes, accusing him directly of negligence and inconsistency, and somewhat less overtly of Jansenist leanings. He takes him to task for quoting St. Augustine's more extreme statements on the question of grace, without pointing out that these must be understood in the context of his polemic against the Pelagian heretics.¹⁵¹ Clearly he feels that Lenglet deliberately used only those Augustinian texts which conform with the Jansenist position on the subject; on one such note he concludes:

Elle n'est propre qu'à obscurcir un passage assez clair de luy même, et à donner pour le vrai sens de l'Ecriture une objection des Heretiques.¹⁵²

He ends his commentary with the hope that Lenglet will heed his criticisms in the edition of the Bible which he intends to publish.¹⁵³

Though highly antagonistic, the writer of this article undoubtedly attached a good deal of importance to Lenglet's publication; and the comments of the Jesuit-run journal indicate what must have been the response of the Oratorian theologians at Saint-Magloire whose influence on the young man

is marked in the Jansenist orientations of his work. The edition was reprinted several times during the first half of the eighteenth century, specifically, Lenglet tells us, 'pour l'usage des séminaires'.¹⁵⁴

This, and the other works which Lenglet edited during this period, were anonymous: the fact that the approbation for the Novum Testamentum was signed by his ex-master Pirot suggests that his reasons for not putting his name to them were other than modest self-effacement. Pirot would undoubtedly have blocked his reprobate student's works when they were submitted to the Sorbonne censors, as all religious books necessarily were. But the Trévoux journalists learned the editor's name from the printer,¹⁵⁵ and mentioned it in their review. This gave rise to a curious incident. A canon of the order of Sainte-Geneviève, who taught theology in the Seminary of Reims, had claimed the edition as his own. He made presents of copies of the book to the Superiors of his Congregation, and was warmly congratulated by them. But the fraud was discovered when Lenglet's name appeared in the Mémoires de Trévoux, and the Abbot and Prior of the unfortunate priest's Congregation sent their librarian to interview Lenglet, who confirmed the report. The offender, on hearing the outcome of the interview, disappeared from his monastery one morning and retired to the Grisons, where he taught theology for the rest of his life.¹⁵⁶ This incident no doubt further enhanced Lenglet's growing reputation.

In the same year he published an edition of the general history and chronology of the famous Jesuit scholar Denis Petau: Rationarium Temporum in partes tres...Editio novissima. Ad haec tempora perducta; Tabulis Chronologicis atque Notis historicis et Dissertationibus auctior facta.¹⁵⁷ The work contains a preface in which Lenglet explains how he has brought the historical résumé up to date from 1632-1702, and added his own notes

and chronologies etc. There was a short and anodine compte-rendu inserted in the Journal des savants of 1705,¹⁵⁸ in which the editor was praised for leaving Petau's text intact, and putting his additions in brackets and note form. But the worth of this edition was probably best evaluated by Lenglet himself in the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire of 1713; of the Rationarium Temporum he says:

Il faut se servir de l'Edition nouvelle qui vient de paraître en Hollande, beaucoup plus exacte que l'Edition de Paris imprimée en 1703. Cette dernière est pleine de fautes considérables; la continuation qu'on y a jointe, est peu exacte pour l'histoire, et d'une médiocre latinité: les dissertations, les remarques et les tables chronologiques sont de pures compilations, qui ne doivent point accompagner un ouvrage aussi exact que celui du Père Petau.¹⁵⁹

As Michault remarks, it is hard to believe that an editor could make such harsh comments about his own work.¹⁶⁰ One can only assume that it was produced hastily under pressure from the publisher Delaulne with whom Lenglet seems to have formed some sort of association at this period: the Novum Testamentum, Rationarium Temporum and Diurnal romain were all published by him. Delaulne had held a privilège for an edition of the Petau since 1688,¹⁶¹ and may well have wanted the project brought to a speedy conclusion at this point if he felt the market was right. The terms of the agreements made between publishers and authors from the middle of the seventeenth century onwards encouraged the latter to sacrifice the quality of their work to a quick turnover.¹⁶² Many of Lenglet's subsequent publications are similarly marred as a result of the anomalous position of the writer trying to live by his pen in this period of transition from the system of patronage to the recognition of the rights of the author. It was a subject which much embittered him, and on which he had a deal to say in later life. Poor though this edition may be, it is the first major manifestation of the interest in historical research and its methodology which was to be the dominant feature in Lenglet's œuvre.

The last of the publications of this 'student' period, which in fact appeared in 1705 some time after Lenglet had passed his Licence, was Le Diurnal romain, en latin et en français....Imprimé par ordre de Son Altesse Serenissime Madame La Princesse.¹⁶³ The privilège for this work had been granted to Lenglet himself, who passed it on to Delaulne. There is no dedication or preface to indicate how Anne of Bavaria, wife of Henri Jules de Bourbon, Prince de Condé, came to request this translation of him. It is more than likely that he owed the opportunity to his fellow-student and patron, Armand-Gaston de Rohan;¹⁶⁴ he could not himself have been in direct contact with such high aristocratic circles at this stage of his career. The translation was mediocre, but it was nevertheless reprinted twice in the 1730's; the copy in the Réserve of the Bibliothèque Nationale is bound with the arms of Marie Antoinette, Dauphine. In all, Lenglet had quite an impressive publishing record on leaving the benches of the Sorbonne.

He profited from his years in the faculty and seminary in another important respect: he got to know some influential people who would serve him well in his literary activities. The most eminent of these was Armand-Gaston de Rohan,¹⁶⁵ future Cardinal and member of the Académie Française and the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres. Born the same year as Lenglet, he was a contemporary student in theology, and passed his Licence with great brilliance in 1699. De Rohan was the first of many members of the nobility of sword and robe who encouraged Lenglet's literary endeavours by opening to him their rich personal libraries, and this despite the shadier aspects of his character and his many clashes with the royal administration of which they must have been aware. Without their cooperation he could not have succeeded in producing his historical works, and the bibliographies for which he became famous. Just what the degree of the relationship between

Lenglet and the Cardinal was is unclear, but Michault states that 'M. le Cardinal de Rohan l'honorait d'une estime et d'une bienveillance particulières',¹⁶⁶ and in the preface to his Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc¹⁶⁷ Lenglet the octogenarian pays a tribute of thanks to the late Cardinal for the generous help he afforded him throughout his life. His grand-nephew, the Cardinal de Soubise,¹⁶⁸ who succeeded not only to his bishopric but also to his library, continued the patronage of Lenglet who in turn was useful to the Cardinal as a researcher.

Another contemporary student, Pierre Guérin de Tencin,¹⁶⁹ was also a protégé of Rohan's, and was to become Cardinal in 1739 thanks to the efforts of his enterprising sister. He was in the same Licence class as Lenglet in 1703-1704,¹⁷⁰ and was chosen from among his group to be Prieur¹⁷¹ for the second year. In this capacity he presided at Lenglet's Sorbonique;¹⁷² it was his duty to pronounce a little speech and a few lines of poetry in honour of the candidate. Almost fifty years later Lenglet was still sending him copies of his new publications; and de Tencin sent him details of a manuscript in the Abbaye de Saint-Pierre in Lyon, where he was archbishop, which Lenglet used in his collection of essays on apparitions and visions in 1751. He proudly published Tencin's flattering reply to him which ended:

Voilà, Monsieur, tout ce que je puis vous procurer pour l'édition que vous projetez et dont je recevrai un Exemplaire avec le même plaisir que tout ce qui me vient de votre part.¹⁷³

During this period he had also established contact with a wide variety of personalities in the Parisian literary circles. Among those whom he mentions are Louis Ferrand, 'avocat au Parlement de Paris', an érudit who wrote many works of apologetics in reply to the Calvinists, and who encouraged Lenglet in his early ecclesiastical studies;¹⁷⁴ and at the other end of the spectrum Pierre Richelet, grammarian and lexicographer in the libertin tradition. He had composed, Lenglet tells us, a Dictionnaire

comique ou satirique which was 'un Recueil de toutes les turpitudes dites et à dire en Français', but sacrificed it to his confessor on his death-bed, 'dont bien en prit à nos oreilles et à notre imagination' as Lenglet regretfully remarks.¹⁷⁵ The abbé's taste for the satiric and the gallic was no doubt encouraged by his association with Richelet during the last two years of the latter's life.

In addition to such activities, Lenglet was ordained a priest in Paris at some stage before 1704.¹⁷⁶ He finished his final two years of study leading up to the Licence which he was awarded, as was traditional, on the 'lundy gras' of the year 1704. No doubt he would have graduated in the previous Licence (1702) had it not been for his expulsion of 1696. At the Licence ceremony Lenglet was placed ninth out of a class of one hundred and four students;¹⁷⁷ since the first four places were reserved for special categories of licenciés,¹⁷⁸ he therefore figured prominently in the order of merit. It is clear from this result that Lenglet was held in high regard by his teachers, and that his record in latter years outweighed whatever stigma may have attached to his ejection from the Maison de Sorbonne.

Thus Lenglet at the close of his student days had already acquired a certain reputation in ecclesiastical circles as a theologian and textual critic of no mean ability. His intellectual affinity was with the modernist school in the Oratorian tradition, an affinity which was no doubt strengthened by the opening of hostilities between him and the Jesuit editors of the Mémoires de Trévoux. A young man of solid bourgeois family, with Lenglet's intellectual ability and a powerful protector such as Rohan, could have hoped for a steady and successful career in the bosom of the church had he been content to court a reasonable degree of orthodoxy, at least in his public life. But Lenglet's early peccadillo in the Marie d'Agréda affair was only the first of

innumerable attacks on authority which emanated from an exceptionally disorderly personality, and which precluded any such an 'honnête' career. He would never be a churchman. Moreover the multiplicity of his subsequent activities and of his literary production is prefigured by the variety of his social contacts in this early period: difficult it must have been for his contemporaries to predict the future of the young clerical student who set out from his seminary to visit Bossuet one day, and Richelet the next.

Notes to Chapter I

1. Letter to Cardinal Domenico Passionei, 7 Oct. 1754: 'Avant hier j'ai eu quatre-vingt ans revolus et il y a eu hier quatre-vingt ans que j'ai été baptisé à la paroisse St. Eustache' (Vat.Lat.9813, f.48). This is the only piece of evidence I have found to establish Lenglet's place of birth; the parish registers for Paris were destroyed during the Commune fires. The early biographers followed Déon de Beaumont, 'Mort de M. l'abbé Lenglet du Fresnoy', L'Année littéraire, iii (1755), 116-39, in assuming that he was born in Beauvais. It should be added that de Beaumont, who knew Lenglet and his sister personally, is normally a reliable source. See Manson Milner Brien, 'Note on the birthplace of abbé Lenglet Du Fresnoy', The Romanic Review, xxv(1934), 378-80, for a discussion of the scanty evidence hitherto available on the subject. Brien had not seen Lenglet's correspondence with Passionei.

I have retained the original spelling and punctuation in all quotations from manuscript sources and have therefore not added 'sic' at each instance.

2. The form Langlet is also commonly used by members of the family.
3. See statement by Nicolas during a police interrogation in 1718 in Joseph Delort, Histoire de la détention des philosophes et des gens de lettres à la Bastille, Paris, 1881, ii, 62, and also J. T. Dupont-White, Mélanges historiques, littéraires et archéologiques, Beauvais, 1847, p.xcviii.
4. See below, pp.8-9 and 11.
5. See Pierre Goubert, Familles marchandes sous l'Ancien Régime: les Danse et les Motte, de Beauvais, Paris, S.E.V.P.E.N., 1959, pp.1-19, and A. Daumard and F. Furet, Structures et relations sociales à Paris au milieu du XVIIIe siècle, Paris, Colin, 1961, for an indication of the relative 'niveaux de fortune' at this period.
6. Information communicated by M. P. Goubert.
7. Dupont-White, loc.cit.; unfortunately, the author gave no source references. The material on which he based his statements may well have been destroyed in the bombing of the Archives Municipales de Beauvais during the second World War. I have found no documents concerning the Lenglet family in the extant archives in Beauvais.

Michel Lenglet died some time prior to 1724: cf. letter of that year from his widow to the Lieutenant Général de Police, Bastille 10784, f.276.
8. See letter dated 1729 where she states she is now 88 years old, Bastille 10836, f.256. Both Nicolas and her daughter Marguerite reached almost as great an age.
9. See Dreux du Radier, L'Europe illustrée, Paris, Odieuvre, 1765, v, article on 'Langlet du Fresnoy'; and 'Mémoire pour la vie de M. Pidou

de Saint Olon, Envoyé-Extraordinaire à Gênes, Ambassadeur à Maroc', also by du Radier, who knew Lenglet personally, in Suite de la Clef ou Journal historique sur les matières du temps, lxxvi (Dec. 1754), 427-39.

10. See for example letter to Passionei, Vat.Lat.9813, ff.20-6.
11. Nicolas liked to boast that he was born 'à deux mille pas' from the Château de la Bastille to which he paid many a visit in later life (De l'Usage des romans, Preface) and his sister Marguerite resided in the Marais for several years before her marriage (Minutier LXVII, 308, 'Constitution de Rentes', 20 Mar. 1715). So presumably this is where their relatives lived, and Nicolas was born.
12. Albert Launay, 'L'Ancien Collège de Beauvais (1545-1793)', Bulletin de la Société d'études historiques, géographiques et scientifiques de la région parisienne, lxxxiv (1954), 23.
13. Since the first instance I have found occurs in the privilège for his anonymous edition of the Diurnal romain in 1705, it is possible that at the outset it was used as a pseudonym to avoid discovery by the Sorbonne censors. (See below, p.34)
14. See Letter from Nicolas to the Lieutenant Général de Police, Bastille 10836, Oct. 1729.
15. See files on Antoine in Bastille 10134, 10784 and 10836. His end remains obscure as the Archives de la Somme do not hold any papers from the Château de Ham in the pre-revolutionary period. He presumably died before Nicolas, for there is no mention of him in the settling of the affairs of the latter's estate (cf. Chapter VI, pp.431-2).
16. See Contrat de mariage, Minutier LXVII,330, 27 Jan. 1719. Urbain was still an active Lieutenant de la connétablie in 1730, when he lodged a complaint against a member of his company who was imprisoned for insubordination (see Archives de Paris, 5 AZ 3303).
17. Cf. Partage, Minutier XCV,142, 6 Oct. 1737.
18. Contrat de mariage, Minutier LXVII,330, 27 Jan. 1719.
19. My point of reference for the evaluation of their resources is the figures established for 1749 by Furet and Daumard, op.cit. (pp.18-19). Obviously, allowance must be made for the thirty-year time lag, but this can only increase the relative importance of the de la Barre fortune at the earlier date.
20. See later Chapters for details of his career.
21. Partage, Minutier XCV,142, 6 Oct. 1737.
22. Contrat de mariage between M. de Mailly, Baron de Montejean, and Mlle Langlet de Percel (or de Cerzay), Minutier XCV,290, 10 Sep. 1763.
23. Minutier LXVII,330, 27 Jan. 1719. Cf. Chapter III, p.103, below re these writers.
24. Histoire de la philosophie hermétique, Paris, Coustelier, 1742, p.101.

25. See Bastille 11301, f.90, on his arrest in 1735: it states he has been living in Brussels for fifteen years.
26. Lenglet wrote in a letter to his sister Marguerite, which he had hoped to smuggle out of the prison: 'Ecrivez je vous en prie a Jacques et defendez lui sur toutes choses de revenir en france; nous avons dans Arnaut de B. un ennemi secret et outré de la protection que nous a accordé M. Le Blanc; car il me l'a bien reproché! Je crois qu'il ne nous avoit donné il y a 9 mois un faux avis que pour savoir ou il etoit' (Bastille 10801, Dossier de la Barre); re Lenglet's relations with Le Blanc see below, Chapters II and III.
27. His daughter on her marriage had no legacy from her father; her dowry was given in its entirety by her aunt.
28. Minutier XCV,290, 10 Sep. 1763; see also 'Inventaire', XCV,238, 31 Jan. 1755. Undoubtedly Madame de la Barre, who had more or less adopted the girl, was attempting to give some sort of status to her roturier niece.
29. The first volume of this work was in fact written by Philibert Joseph Le Roux and published by Nicolas Stryckwant in 1732; after Le Roux's death it was continued by 'le Chevalier Lenglet de Percel' as stated on the title-page to vol. ii, published in 1735. The work was to comprise 3 vols., but only two appear to have been published. Cf. Jean-Bernard Michault, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la vie et des ouvrages de Monsieur l'abbé Lenglet du Fresnoy, London [Paris], Duchesne, 1761, pp.109-10.
30. Correspondance de Jean-Baptiste Rousseau et de Brossette, Paris, Cornély, 1910-11, ii, 70.
31. See Minutier XCV,238, 31 Jan. 1755 and XCV,290, 10 Sep. 1763.
32. Bastille 11301, ff.86-9.
33. Minutier XCV,238, 31 Jan. 1755.
34. See Bastille 11301, ff.81-91; also Paris, Archives de la Préfecture de Police, Aa5, f.493.
35. François de Thienne, Ecuyer: See 'Inventaire' in Minutier XCV,238, 31 Jan. 1755.
36. Minutier, ibid.
37. Cf. F. Bluche and P. Durye, L'Anoblissement par charges avant 1789 (Les Cahiers nobles,XXIII-XXIV), Paris, 1962, pp.47-59.
38. For Jacques cf. Note 27 above; in the file on Antoine it is expressly stated by his family that he has 'aucun bien' (letter 1732, Bastille 10836, f.276). When Nicolas dies in 1755 his three presumptive heirs renounce the succession on the grounds that it is 'plus onéreuse que profitable'. (Minutier XCV,239, 1, 4 and 15 Mar. 1755).
39. See Launay, op.cit., p.23. Lenglet gives 1693 as the date of his departure for Paris in a police interrogation in 1718 (Delort, Détention des philosophes, p.62), but in interviews with Dreux du Radier (L'Europe illustrée) he evidently stated he had left Beauvais in 1689. Since we know that he was in his second year of theology in 1696 (Traité sur les apparitions, ii,229-30), and it was obligatory to

spend two years in a Collège before entering the Faculty, a date around 1692-3 is the more likely.

40. See Charles Fauqueux, Beauvais, son histoire, des origines à nos jours, Beauvais, Imprimerie Centrale Administrative, 1938, p.176.
41. Cf. G.-H. Quignon, La bibliothèque de la ville de Beauvais, Paris, Champion, 1904, p.10. Having described the composition of the College library of barely 1,000 books, the author concludes: 'La bibliothèque du Collège [...] n'était pas au courant des publications du XVII^e et du XVIII^e siècle; l'enseignement visait, semble-t-il, la culture formelle de l'esprit par les langues mortes, le grec et le latin, plutôt que l'acquisition des idées.' (p.11)
42. Fauqueux, loc.cit.
43. Dreux du Radier, op.cit. Adrien Baillet (1649-1706) had taught in the Collège de Beauvais before becoming librarian to the Avocat général Lamoignon in 1680, on the recommendation of Godefroy Hermant. Lenglet may well have met him when he went to study in Paris. The book in question is Des enfants devenus célèbres par leurs études ou par leurs écrits, Paris, Dezallier, 1688, pp.524.
44. Fauqueux, op.cit., pp.130 ff.
45. He was bishop of Beauvais from 1650 to his death in 1679; he was one of the quatre évêques who refused to sign the formulary of Alexander VII. He received rare praise from Lenglet, who called him a 'grand et saint Evêque; on n'en trouve plus de cette trempe', words which were deleted by the censor from the 1729 edition of his Méthode pour étudier l'histoire (cf. Guillaume de Bure, Catalogue des livres de la bibliothèque de feu M. de Duc de la Vallière, I^{ère} Partie, iii, 11). Buzanval's faithful pupil and defender, Godefroy Hermant, remained as Chanoine in Beauvais up to his death in 1690, and may well have been among those savants who frequented the Lenglet home.
46. Fauqueux, op.cit., p.131.
47. François Ledieu, Mémoires et journal sur la vie et les ouvrages de Bossuet, Paris, Didier, 1856, i, 173.
48. Fauqueux, op.cit., p.131.
49. During a police interrogation in 1696 Lenglet states that he did his Philosophie in the Collège de Beauvais in Paris. See Bastille 10505, f.185.
50. See Maxime Targe, Professeurs et régents de collège dans l'ancienne Université de Paris, Paris, Hachette, 1902, Chap. I.
51. See Marie-Dominique Chapotin, Le Collège de Dormans-Beauvais et la Chapelle Saint Jean l'Evangeliste, Paris, Durand et Pedone-Lauriel, 1870, pp.319 ff.
There is little archival material extant from the Collège. The registers conserved in the Archives Nationales, Series MM 351-365, do not, unfortunately, include records of student names. Some information on the bourses et boursiers can be found in Series M 92 and 93; Lenglet's name does not figure among those to whom scholarships were awarded by

the Collège, so he was probably a fee-paying student. It is possible, of course, that the information contained in these files is incomplete.

52. H. Ferté, Rollin, sa vie, ses œuvres et L'Université de son temps, Paris, Hachette, 1902, p.38.
53. See Chapotin, loc.cit.
54. Lenglet so describes himself in the course of the 1696 interrogation, (Bastille 10505, f.185).
55. See article in the Biographie universelle, ed. L.-G. Michaud, Paris, Desplaces, 1843, xxxiii, 404 (abbreviated as Biog.univers. in subsequent notes).
56. There is very little information available on the organisation of studies in the Faculté de Théologie; the following details are taken from a description published in the Mercure galant of 1709 (Aug., pp.53-88, Sep., pp.22-78, and Oct., pp.31-72).
57. L'Encyclopédie, Paris, Libraires associés, 1751-65, xvi, 251.
58. Oeuvres de Marot, (1731), i, 521 Note 1.
59. Letter to Pierre Bayle, 10 Feb. 1696, in Choix de la correspondance inédite de Pierre Bayle, ed. Gigas, Copenhagen, Gad , 1890, p.253.
60. i, 179.
61. See Henri Drouon, Bossuet à Meaux, Paris, 1900, p.31; and Biog.univers., v, 134.
62. i, 177 ff.
63. Marie Coronel had died in 1665. The title of the translation was as follows: La mystique cité de Dieu, Miracle de sa toute-puissance, abîme de la grâce, histoire divine de la très Sainte-Vierge Marie Mère de Dieu, notre reine et maîtresse. Manifestée dans ces dernières siècles par la Ste Vierge à la Soeur Marie de Jésus, Abesse du Couvent de l'Immaculée Conception de la ville d'Agréda, de l'ordre de S. François; et écrite par cette même Soeur, par ordre de ses supérieurs et de ses confesseurs, Marseille, Martel, 1695.
64. See Correspondance de Bossuet, ed. Urbain and Levesque, Paris, Hachette, 1909-25, vii, 406, Note 5.
65. Ibid., pp.365-6: Letter 12 Apr., 1696.
66. Ibid., p.406, Note 5.
67. See 'Censure faite par la Faculté de Théologie de Paris...' in the Traité sur les apparitions, ii, 257-9.
68. Bastille 10505, ff.178-88.
69. Louis Boucherat (1616-1699); he suppressed the book on its appearance 'parce que le Privilege lui en avait été surpris' (Abrégé des disputes, p.7).

70. Bastille 10505, f.188.
71. See Bibliography, 1.01. Lenglet states in the Traité sur les apparitions that he wrote the piece during the month of May (ii,199). It was published just a couple of days before the Faculty met on 2 July to hear the report of those doctors who had been appointed to examine the Agréda book (see Traité sur les apparitions, ii, 257 ff. and Correspondance de Bossuet, viii,3, for confirmation of the date of this assembly). Some slight confusion arises from the fact that in his Abrégé des disputes (p.9) Lenglet wrongly dates this meeting as June instead of July, but he gave the correct date during the police interrogations in August (Bastille 10505, f.185). Lenglet signed the pamphlet with the letters 'E.E.T.S.M.M.D.L. et P.', which, he tells us in the Traité sur les apparitions (ii,229-30), signified 'Etudiant en Théologie sous MM. De Lestocq Et Piro'.
 72. The extent to which Lenglet's publication was up to date in its information is indicated by the fact that it included the text of the Decretum of the Roman Inquisition which was not readily available in Paris, since Bossuet was obliged to ask his nephew in Rome to procure him a copy (letter 20 May, Corr. de Bossuet, vii,406), and he did not in fact receive it until the end of July.
 73. Lettre à Messieurs les Doyen, p.4.
 74. Ibid., pp.8-9.
 75. Ibid., pp.9-10.
 76. Ibid., p.13.
 77. Ibid.
 78. Ibid., p.16.
 79. Ibid., p.18.
80. Réponse à un libelle contre la Vénérable Mère Marie de Jesus, Abesse du Monastère de l'Immaculée Conception de la ville d'Agréda en Espagne, intitulé, Lettre à Messieurs les Doyen, Syndic, et Docteurs en Théologie de la Faculté de Paris, n.p., 1696, p.21.
81. See below, Chapter VI, pp.400 ff.
82. Pierre Bayle, Dictionnaire historique et critique, Rotterdam, Leers, 1697. This edition did not mention the 'affaire de Marie Agréda', but the second edition of 1702 contained a highly satirical article along the lines which Lenglet seems to predict in his pamphlet.
83. See Mémoires de Trévoux, Mar. 1704, p.379. Richard Simon had published many of his major studies of the Old and New Testaments between 1678 and 1695; cf. Paul Auvray, Richard Simon, 1638-1712, Paris, P.U.F., 1974.
84. Robert Palmer, Catholics and Unbelievers in eighteenth-century France, Princeton, P.U.P., 1939, p.61.
85. See Dreux du Radier, L'Europe illustrée, and the Traité sur les apparitions, i, Préface.

86. See below, p.38.
87. Abrégé des disputes, pp.9-10. If the aggressive tone of the pamphlet was abhorrent to Marie d'Agréda's supporters, it no doubt in large part accounted for its success among the public. As J.-B. Michault commented: 'D'une part, le sujet était fait pour exciter la curiosité; de l'autre, la maniere dont il fut présenté au Public parut vive et piquante: en falloit-il davantage pour annoncer favorablement un jeune Auteur?' (Mémoires, pp.23-4).
88. This was the Réponse à un libelle, which Père Clouzeil eventually published.
89. See Dreux du Radier, op.cit., and Michault, Mémoires, p.23.
90. See Bibliography, 2.01.
91. See below, Chapter VI, p.402.
92. The procès-verbal of the two interrogations is conserved in Bastille 10505, ff.178-88; the reference to Pirot's part in the arrest is on f.182. That Lenglet was actually imprisoned at this time is stated in a document in the Archives de la Police (Préfecture, Paris), Série Bastille, A^A; and in Bastille 10880, ff.251-76, relating to Lenglet's arrest in 1725, there is a note which states: 'Il a été encore à la Bastille en l'année 1696 pour fait de Religion'.
93. See Anne Sauvy, Livres saisis à Paris entre 1678 et 1701, the Hague, Nijhoff, 1976, p.5.
94. Bastille 10505, f.185.
95. See Sauvy, op.cit., p.41. The date given here (14 Aug.) is undoubtedly an erroneous entry in the original manuscript, as it is obvious from the text of the interrogations that the seizure was made between 17 and 20 August.
96. Bastille 10505, f.182.
97. Pirot himself was, in fact, shortly to become embroiled in the Quietist affair on Bossuet's side: it was he who interrogated Madame Guyon on behalf of the Sorbonne, and he was responsible for the censure of Fénelon's Explication des maximes des saints in 1698. He can scarcely have approved of an extravagant visionary like Marie d'Agréda, and would undoubtedly have been sympathetic towards any denunciations of her book.
98. L'Abbé Ladvoat, Dictionnaire historique et bibliographique portatif, Paris, Le Clerc, 1777, p.55. Ladvoat became librarian in the Sorbonne in 1742 and knew Lenglet personally (cf. Lenglet's Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc, i, p.xxxv).
99. He took his degree in 1704; normally he would have passed with the previous class.
100. Mémoires, p.23.

101. Lester Segal, 'Lenglet Du Fresnoy: the treason of a cleric in eighteenth-century France', Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, cxvi, 258.
102. See Bibliography, 1.02 and 2.02.
103. See Ladvocat, loc.cit., and also Traité sur les apparitions, ii, 237. This seminary had been established on a firm basis in 1642 (cf. Prunel, 'Les premiers séminaires en France au XVIIIe siècle', Etudes, Feb. 1909, pp.344-55). Unfortunately none of the record-books have survived (cf. Jeanne Ferté, La vie religieuse dans les campagnes parisiennes, Paris, Vrin, 1962, p.155), and no archival material relating to Lenglet's stay there has come to light.
104. J. Ferté, op.cit., p.167.
105. Ibid., p.159.
106. Lenglet states in a 'Mémoire' in 1709 (Arch. de la Guerre, A¹ 2149, no. 134) that 'il a été [. . .] deux ans au seminaire de St. Magloire, où on lui a rendu de bons temoignages.'
107. J. Ferté, op.cit., p.157.
108. Gérard Viatte, 'L'Oratoire et l'éducation des clercs. Le séminaire Saint-Magloire', Oratoriana, 1931, i, 57.
109. Cf. H. Ferté, Rollin, pp.176 ff.
110. See Lionel Gossman, Medievalism and the ideologies of the enlightenment. The world and work of La Curne de Sainte-Palaye, Baltimore, Johns Hopkins, pp.5-7, and also Robert Shackleton, Montesquieu, a critical biography, London, O.U.P., 1961, pp.6-7.
111. See Traité sur les apparitions, 'Lettre de l'auteur au R.P. Matthieu de Jesus-Maria, Prieur des Carmes Déchaussés de Madrid', (ii, 237-40). It is signed 'Datum Parisiis in aedibus sacerdotalibus S. Jacobi ab Alto Passu in suburbio Parisiensi, die 30 Junii anni 1697'.
112. Ibid., ii, 241-3.
113. See Bibliography, 55.01.
114. Traité sur les apparitions, ii, pp.39-47.
115. Ibid., p.36.
116. Ibid., pp.51-70. This is one of the earliest manifestations of Lenglet's interest in textual criticism; he dwells on the inconsistency in the fact of an uneducated nun being able to quote copiously from theologians who wrote only in Latin, and put scholastic terminology into the mouths of all the protagonists in her book.
117. See ibid., i, Préface pp.iii-iv, for the date at which they were written.
118. Ibid., pp.2-12.
119. Ibid., p.45.

120. Ibid., pp.25 ff.
121. Ibid., pp.12 ff.
122. Cf. Palmer, Catholics and unbelievers, pp.92-5.
123. Traité sur les apparitions, i, 158 ff.
124. Ibid., p.54.
125. Ibid., pp.110-33.
126. Ibid., pp.117-21. Jacques de Sainte-Beuve (1613-1677), who favoured the teachings of Saint Augustin, was expelled from the Sorbonne in 1658 because of his refusal to subscribe to that body's condemnation of Arnauld. Most of his works were unpublished, the manuscripts being preserved in the Sorbonne where the young Lenglet could easily have consulted them (Biog.univers., xxxvii, 280-1).
127. Ibid., pp.127 ff., and also p.170. The technique of quoting a subversive criticism, from which the author theoretically dissociates himself, but which he does not adequately refute, is one which Lenglet uses repeatedly here: see, for example, Bayle's remarks on the miracles claimed by religious orders which he quotes on ibid., p.98. This subterfuge became highly popular with the philosophes in later decades, and Lenglet himself used it with great boldness in a number of his later works.
128. Ibid., p.112. There are many other manifestations of Lenglet's irony. See, for example, the terms in which he speaks of St. Teresa of Avila: 'Quelle abondante moisson d'Apparitions, de Visions et de Révelations particulières, a produit Ste Thérèse [...] Les Protestants, gens qui ne sont point accoutumés à cette sublime Théologie, n'ont pu s'empêcher d'en témoigner leur chagrin, et leur étonnement. Que dirons-nous de cette Ste Thérèse qui avait toujours J.C. à ses côtes? Paroles insultantes du Ministre Jurieux, qui depuis s'est plongé dans la lie et la fange d'une basse Mysticité' (Ibid., p.279).
129. Ibid., pp.60-157.
130. Ibid., p.157.
131. Ibid., p.ii.
132. See Dreux du Radier, L'Europe illustrée. Jean Gerbais (1629-1699) was principal of the Collège de Reims in Paris. He wrote 'des ouvrages peu nombreux, mais solides'. (Biog.univers., xiv, 299-300).
133. Lenglet published an essay by him in the Traité sur les apparitions (i, 384-408) on which he commented: 'Je la dois à l'ancienne amitié de son Auteur' (Préface, p.ix). Pirot and Lestocq were, we have seen, the directors of Lenglet's studies on his entry to the Sorbonne: cf. note 71 above.
134. It became a tradition in Saint-Magloire for little sociétés of seven or eight students to meet and chat in one or other of their rooms during the recreation period after lunch; presumably Lenglet's literary endeavours provided an interesting topic of discussion for these

- miniature salons . (See Viatte, 'L'Oratoire et l'éducation des clercs', pp.57-8).
135. See Chapter VI below, pp.402 ff, re the publication of the work.
 136. See below Chapter VI, pp.404-5.
 137. See Viatte, 'L'Oratoire et l'éducation des clercs', p.55: these were the New Testament, the Breviary, and the Imitation of Jesus Christ.
 138. See Bibliography, 3.01.
 139. 1698 is the date Lenglet gives for the work in a 'Mémoire' submitted to Malesherbe, Directeur de la Librairie, in 1754, under the title 'Services que l'Abbé Lenglet Dufresnoy a rendu a la Religion, a l'Etat et au Roy' (Nouv.acq.franç. 3344, f.48 ff.): and in this he is followed by the early biographers. But according to J.M. Quérard (La France littéraire, Paris, Firmin Didot, 1827-39, v, 158) the earliest edition dates from 1700.
 140. See Augustin de Backer, Essai bibliographique sur le livre De Imitatione Christi, Liège, Grandmont-Donders, 1864, p.202.
 141. See Nouv.acq.franç. 3344, f.48.
 142. Cf. Henri-Jean Martin, Livre, pouvoirs et société à Paris au XVIIe siècle, Genève, Droz, 1969, ii, 782 ff.
 143. See de Beaumont, L'Année littéraire, iii (1755), 118, and Michault, Mémoires, p.66; but Quérard, La France littéraire, v, 158, contests this.
 144. See Bibliography, 4.01 ff.
 145. Journal des savants, Aug. 1703, 529-34; and Mémoires de Trévoux, Mar. 1704, 374-88.
 146. Journal des savants, p.530.
 147. Ibid., p.532.
 148. Ibid., p.534. Lenglet's biographer Michault, writing in 1761, echoed the terms of this eulogious review: 'Depuis les Editions que Robert Estienne fit au commencement du Calvinisme de quelques Livres de l'Ecriture sainte, on n'avoit point encore vu de notes qui, en si peu de paroles, renfermassent tant de choses' (Mémoires, p.149).
 149. Mémoires de Trévoux, p.377.
 150. Ibid., pp.378-9.
 151. Ibid., pp.379-87. Pelagus and his followers did not believe that the human race had inherited original sin, and therefore held that purely natural grace was sufficient to enable man to attain a state of perfection.
 152. Ibid., p.388.
 153. No such edition ever appeared.

154. Cf. Bibliography; Lenglet's remark is in *Nouv.acq.franç.* 3344, f.48.
155. See de Beaumont, *op.cit.*, p.119; but the author erroneously gives the date of the Trévoux article as Nov. 1703.
156. *Ibid.*, pp.118-9.
157. See Bibliography, 5.01.
158. Feb. 1705, pp.90-2.
159. i, 27-8.
160. Michault, *Mémoires*, p.150; but Lenglet's editorship is attested by his statement in *Nouv.acq.franç.* 3344, f.48.
161. See Continuation de privilège at the back of vol. iii.
162. See Martin, Livre, pouvoirs et société, ii, 914 ff. Martin quotes a passage from Gabriel Guéret, 'Promenade de Saint-Cloud', who as early as 1669 could remark: 'Vous ne sauriez croire, [...] combien le commerce qui se fait avec les libraires et les comédiens gâte tous les jours de bonnes plumes. On ne voit quasi plus personne qui travaille purement pour sa gloire et l'argent fait faire la plus grande partie de tous les livres que vous voyez.'
163. See Bibliography, 6.01 ff.
164. Cf. Dupont-White, Mélanges historiques, p.ciii, who says Lenglet 'eut pour premier patron le Cardinal de Rohan'.
165. 1674-1749; son of the first Prince de Soubise and Anne de Rohan-Chabot, he became a favourite at the court of Louis XIV. Intelligent and learned, he was a generous patron of the arts and letters, and as such was admitted to the Académie Française in 1704. He built up an exceptionally fine library in his Hôtel in Paris (cf. Biog.univers., xxxvi, 336-7).
166. Mémoires, p.22.
167. i, pp.xxv-vi.
168. Armand de Rohan, 1717-56, also became a member of the Académie Française in 1741. Lenglet mentions him frequently in his correspondence with Cardinal Passionei in the 1750 s, in connection with books which he borrowed from his library, and 'Mémoires' which Soubise had asked Lenglet to write for him (Vat.Lat.9813).
169. 1680-1758; son of a family of magistrates, he was a brother of the famous Mme de Tencin who used her influence to further his career. He increased his personal fortune through speculation in Law's Système. Cardinal Fleury made him a Minister of State in 1742, but his favour declined after the death of the Cardinal (Biog.univers., xli, 137-8).
170. B.N., ms. Latin 15440, p.358.
171. The Prieur was nominated by the Maison de Sorbonne; the function was 'honorable, dispendieuse et demande des talents dans ceux qui la

remplissent' (Encyclopédie, xiii, 363).

172. See Lenglet's Recueil de dissertations ... sur les apparitions, les visions et les songes, 1752, i, p.cxxxix.
173. Ibid.
174. 1645-99; Lenglet described him as 'un homme plein d'exactes et de profondes recherches dans toutes les sciences, qu'il soutenait par un grand fond de piété' (Traité des libertés de l'Eglise gallicane, pp.lxxiv-v).
175. 1631-98; see Lenglet's note on Richelet in the 'Avertissement' to his edition of the Histoire de la conquête de la Floride, translated by Richelet.
176. See Ladvocat, Dictionnaire, p.55; and Minutier XCV, 238, 31 Jan. 1755, 'Inventaire après décès', where under 'Papiers' are recorded 'huit pièces qui sont Lettres de Tonsure de prêtrise titre sacerdotal et autres dud. Sr abbé Lenglet'.
177. See B.N.,ms. Latin 15440, p.358.
178. Cf. Mercure de France Aug. 1709, p.81.

CHAPTER II

1705-1714Travel and encounters

When Lenglet finished his studies in 1704, France was already deeply involved in the last of the inglorious wars which marked Louis XIV's reign, that of the Spanish Succession.¹ A fortunate circumstance for the abbé, as such times of crisis afforded employment to innumerable impecunious scholars, either as researchers and pamphleteers, or as secretaries, spies and general odd-job men attached to French diplomats and military officers abroad. Such employment was nonetheless precarious, as the functions of subalterns employed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs were neither regular, nor even official. They were paid, for the duration of their mission, by the diplomat whom they served; there were no fixed tariffs, and the employee was totally dependent on the generosity of his superior. It was only in 1711 that the Marquis de Torcy tried to do something to improve this state of affairs by creating a kind of 'Académie politique' which would train and pay young diplomats. He knew that the insecure position of those who served in foreign countries, and who were often informed of the most momentous affairs of their government, was a serious threat to the security of the state: such men could easily be tempted by bribes from the enemy.² But Lenglet did not benefit from de Torcy's reforms; his whole 'diplomatic' career proves that the Minister had good grounds for concern.

It was Adrien Baillet,³ then librarian to the Avocat Général Lamoignon, who first proposed to the young graduate that he should take up employ-

ment, 'à titre de Secrétaire et de Bibliothécaire', with a certain Baron de Karg;⁴ the latter was Chancellor at the court of Joseph-Clemens of Bavaria, Elector of Cologne, which was at that time established in Lille. The Elector and his brother, Maximilien Emmanuel, Elector of Bavaria, as allies of Louis XIV had been driven back behind the French lines where the King was morally obliged to maintain them and their suite. It would appear however that Louis' ministry was anxious to keep a close eye on what went on in their entourage, and Lenglet was accordingly commissioned secretly by de Torcy's bureau to watch both Karg and the Baron de Siméoni, the Elector's envoy to Paris, lest they should do anything contrary to the interests of the French government.⁵ How exactly this mission was arranged is unclear; but in view of his subsequent behaviour it is likely that having secured the post with Karg, Lenglet simply offered his services as a spy through a contact such as the abbé Dubos, a fellow beauvaisien and friend of Baillet, who had been employed by the Minister since the beginning of the war.⁶ Lenglet was undoubtedly exaggerating in typical fashion when he later claimed he had been sent to the Electoral court in Lille by the Marquis de Torcy 'en qualité de premier Secrétaire pour les Langues Latines et Française';⁷ there is no evidence that he held any function more elevated than that of secretary to the Baron de Karg, or that he was personally known to de Torcy.⁸

Lenglet remained in Karg's employment from mid-1705 for a period of something over two years;⁹ he dealt with the Baron's correspondence, looked after his household affairs, and bought books for his library.¹⁰ From references he makes to discussions in which he participated at the Baron's table it is evident he was on good terms with his employer;¹¹ it was no doubt the latter who introduced Lenglet to a number of literary

and political personages whom he met at this time. Prominent among these was the scholarly Jean Godefroy d'Aumont¹² whose father Denis had been 'historiographe du Roy', and who himself held the post of archivist to the Chambre des Comptes in Lille; he became an 'ami particulier' of the abbé,¹³ and it is fair to assume that this contact helped to develop Lenglet's interest in modern French history, and his knowledge of the aims and methodology of historical scholarship. Lenglet also got to know Fénelon, who, as Archbishop of Cambrai, acted as spiritual director to Joseph-Clemens during the years which Lenglet spent in Lille; it was he who consecrated the Elector bishop in the church of Saint-Pierre de Lille on 1 May, 1707.¹⁴ A remark in Lenglet's edition of the Histoire de la régence (1749) indicates that Lenglet used to visit Fénelon at his residence;¹⁵ even in later years Lenglet always expressed a whole-hearted admiration of the great churchman's personal qualities.¹⁶

He apparently also made some enemies, however, for he published a highly venomous pamphlet¹⁷ attacking a certain François Desqueux, confessor to the Elector, who had written several works of spirituality; the most important of these, a Traité de la théologie mystique, had been put on the Index at the same time as one of Madame Guyon's books. He had also shown distinct Jansenist tendencies in subsequent writings.¹⁸ Lenglet takes Desqueux to task for a prayer in which he used the expression 'changer les espèces' with regard to the eucharist, claiming that in Catholic theology the species do not in fact change, and bringing weighty proofs from ecclesiastical authorities to show that such a proposition is 'une erreur intolérable, et même une hérésie'.¹⁹ The seriousness of this doctrinal peccadillo is grossly exaggerated, and used as an excuse for ridiculing the person and character of the unfortunate Desqueux. It

is evident from the tone that Lenglet's dislike was based on personal rather than religious differences; the style is awkward and unsubtle. Whatever the reason for his spite may have been, this pamphlet is the first of many manifestations of one of Lenglet's least admirable traits of character: he felt it necessary to vent in writing his spleen on the occasion of any injury, either real or imaginary.

In the middle of the year 1707 the abbé paid his first visit to Holland; in his Lettres, négociations et pièces secrètes (1744) he mentions negotiations which took place in that year between the two Electors and the Dutch government:²⁰ it is possible that he was sent by Karg on business connected with that affair. He grasped at the opportunity of visiting the major cities;²¹ he was evidently fascinated by the diversity of religious opinions with which he met there, Holland being notoriously the haven of those persecuted on religious or intellectual grounds in France. He made it deliberate policy to meet and speak with representatives of all shades of religious nonconformity.

The most eminent of these, and the one whom Lenglet admired most, was the Protestant minister and theologian, Jacques Basnage. One of a well-known family of Parlementarians in Rouen, who had been forced into exile in 1687 in consequence of the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes, he became a minister in Rotterdam where he rediscovered the friend of his student days, Pierre Bayle.²² A man of great integrity, he used his scholarship in the defence of his co-religionists while being careful never to encourage political rebellion against the French government. He was one of those Protestants whose rigorous critical scholarship published in the cause of controversy was, as Lanson pointed out, a contributing influence in the development of the esprit philosophique in the early eighteenth century.²³ Lenglet, who met Basnage in Rotterdam, listened

eagerly to what he could learn about Bayle,²⁴ for whom, as we have seen, he had a great admiration since his student days, and who had died only a few months previously. They talked about the attitudes of refugee Protestants towards the French government,²⁵ and no doubt also discussed the topic of religious tolerance, central to the politics of the refugees. Lenglet was undoubtedly influenced on this question by his contact with Basnage. Not only does he speak of him always with respect as 'le plus grand homme qu'il y ait eu depuis longtems parmi les Réformés',²⁶ but in the innumerable references to Basnage's writings throughout his bibliographies he invariably praises the scholarship of this 'sage et judicieux critique'.²⁷ Even his Histoire du Vieux et du Nouveau Testament is highly recommended to the French Catholic public, as it is 'sans aucune partialité'.²⁸ Lenglet defended at length this praise of Protestant writers on the grounds of objective rationality in the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire of 1713, answering those who had taken him to task for his stance in the preface to his Novum Testamentum,²⁹ he concluded:

S'il n'est jamais permis de louer un Protestant, parce qu'il est dans une erreur de dogme, il ne sera jamais permis de blâmer un Catholique, parce qu'il est dans la véritable Doctrine.³⁰

Lenglet will always contend that religious prejudice should not be allowed to impinge on the free exercise of critical scholarship. During the succeeding years he kept up a correspondence with Basnage,³¹ which has not, unfortunately, come to light; we do know, however, that the latter possessed certain of Lenglet's works.³²

Lenglet did not confine himself to the more 'orthodox' elements in the non-conformist tradition; he also sought out the 'Enthousiastes', 'Quakers' and 'Trembleurs' in Amsterdam; he describes in his works of the 1750's what went on in their assemblies, where 'le fanatisme du Prédicant se communique presque dans l'instant à l'imagination des assistants de leurs sectes'.³³ He paid more than one visit to such

assemblies moreover, for he recounts how he turned up at their church one Sunday 'pour examiner leur culte', only to be told to his dismay at the entrance 'que l'on ne prophétisait pas ce jour-là'.³⁴

Likewise he got to know several followers of the Quietists and of Antoinette de Bourignon.³⁵ One of these was a renowned Protestant bookseller names Henri Wettstein (or Westein),³⁶ who had 'beaucoup plus de savoir que ne comportait sa profession'; he had published some of the works of Fénelon whom he greatly admired. On one occasion he told Lenglet enthusiastically that he had just said Mass, an action which was apparently not unusual for a follower of Antoinette de Bourignon and Pierre Poiret, 'gens qui embrassaient tout ce qu'ils croyaient de bon et d'édifiant dans toutes les communions, pour s'en former une à leur fantaisie'.³⁷ These experiences in the comparative study of religions were obviously of great interest to Lenglet; it is evident from his comments that he approached them in a rationalistic and critical frame of mind which we have already seen exercised on certain manifestations of the Catholic tradition in his writings on Marie d'Agréda.

It is also from this trip that we can date Lenglet's tortuous relationship with the Jansenist circles in Holland and the Netherlands. That he had strong sympathies with the French Jansenists we have already established; his connection with Baillet offers additional proof of this. One may surmise that Karg too shared such sympathies, for we know that he corresponded not only with Baillet in Paris, but also with Ernest Ruth d'Ans, one of the Solitaires who had been driven out of Port Royal des Champs in 1679, and who had retired to Brussels as faithful friend and secretary to Antoine 'le Grand' Arnauld and later to Pasquier Quesnel.³⁸ Karg may have introduced his young secretary into Jansenist circles in Lille;³⁹ certainly it was on his recommendation that Lenglet got to know d'Ans.⁴⁰ He made

a point of meeting him in Holland, and accompanied him back to Brussels. At the same time Lenglet visited a 'M. de Bagnols', one of the well-known Jansenist family of Dugué de Bagnols who had likewise been connected with Port Royal.⁴¹ During the following years he corresponded with the members of the Quesnel circle; a seizure of his papers in 1711 by the Comte d'Argenson, Lieutenant Général de Police, revealed 16 letters from d'Ans and 14 from Jacques Fouillou, one of the most prolific writers of the 'parti'.⁴² From these letters the Police concluded that Lenglet's relations with the Quesnel group had been 'fort intimes':⁴³

Il faisait revoir ses ouvrages par les jansenistes: Tout ce qu'ils luy Ecrivent prouve qu'il a esté des leurs et instruit de leurs affaires les plus Secrettes.⁴⁴

In addition to widening his intellectual horizons, Lenglet's travels through Dutch and Belgian cities afforded him the opportunity of developing 'business' contacts with a number of booksellers, contacts which he could exploit in two ways: firstly to buy books for the Baron de Karg's library, and possibly for other clients in Lille; secondly, such contacts in Holland, where the booktrade was notoriously free, would be invaluable when he later wanted to publish his own works outside France. Lenglet actually describes his visits to two such libraires: Wettstein in Amsterdam, as we have seen above, and Moetiens whom he saw in the Hague in September of that year, and who recounted to him the circumstances of his publication of the first edition of the Avis aux réfugiés, attributed to Bayle.⁴⁵

Shortly after his return to Lille, Lenglet requested of Karg that he be permitted to retire from his service; the reasons for his doing so are unclear, for he remained in Lille where he had 'differentes occupations particulieres'.⁴⁶ One may surmise that these included his writing, and

his bookselling activities; but it is doubtful that he could have hoped to support himself in such a manner at this early stage of his career, and one may suspect that he had some additional occupation which he did not care to mention to the French authorities. Lenglet claims that he remained on good terms with Karg despite his resignation:

Cela n'empecha point que M. Le Baron de Karg ne temoigna toujours La meme amitié audit Lenglet Dufresnoy et se servit de Lui soit pour payer ses Domestiques, soit pour faire ses emplettes de Livres, et autres, et Ledit Seigneur fit même present audit Lenglet Dufresnoi d'un de ses Carosses, avant qu'il se retirat à Valenciennes La surveillance de L'investissement de Lille.⁴⁷

Some forty years later, in a 'Mémoire' presented to Malesherbes, Lenglet embroidered on this account of his services, stating that Karg left him behind on his departure from the city 'pour avoir soin des effets de l'Electeur et de sa Cour'.⁴⁸ Since he had already left the Baron's service, this was a deliberate distortion of the events and lends weight to the suspicion that there was something not quite 'above board' in his activities during that period for which he felt he needed an alibi.

He did not completely neglect his own literary interests during his stay in Lille. In December 1705 a notice appeared in the Mémoires de Trevoux⁴⁹ informing the public that the letters of Bussy-Rabutin were about to be republished in Flanders; 'Mr. l'Abbé Du-Fresnoy', the new editor, would add a short life of the Comte de Bussy, explanatory notes on almost all of the letters, a large number of hitherto unpublished ones, and a few other items. According to the notice, Lenglet had already written the life, and was preparing the notes, but he was anxious to have the opinion of 'des personnes sçavantes' on the project before giving the work to the printer, and would be grateful if any person who had either letters or biographical information on the Comte de Bussy would communicate them to him in Lille, or to 'Mr. Bronkart Libraire à

Liege'. However, no such edition ever seems to have been actually published, and Lenglet's life of de Bussy presumably remained in his files.

His second project had greater success; this was a Traité historique et dogmatique du secret inviolable de la confession,⁵⁰ printed in Lille during the siege of 1708⁵¹ and distributed in Paris by Musier. It was the second work to appear on the subject in the space of a year; both were responses to recent incidents in the Dioceses of Arras and Tournai where a number of priests had been accused of revealing confessions.⁵² These revelations were attributed to the Jansenist influence; there had been a great deal of controversy on the subject of the secrecy of the confessional from the 1680's onwards at the Faculty of Louvain, where certain Jansenist professors were accused of teaching, out of a desire to reform the morality of the clergy, that a confessor should refuse a certificate of good conduct to an ecclesiastic who had confessed to him a 'peché de la chair'. This, of course, would amount to a breach of the secrecy of the confessional. Gommaire Huygens, chief among the accused, had denied the allegations, and pointed to the theses defended under his presidency and that of his colleagues as proof of the orthodoxy of his teaching.⁵³ The storm had gradually died down with the turn of the century, but was revived by the incidents mentioned above in 1707.

Lenglet sets out the doctrine and tradition of the Church in favour of the secrecy of the confessional, using the writings of the Church Fathers, the Councils and theologians to prove the points he makes. In addition he details historical examples of revelations, in which the judgements of civil and religious authorities add proof of the unvary-

ing Catholic tradition against any revelations by a confessor. The work is highly objective in its approach to the subject; the text makes no mention of the Jansenist dimension. The only way in which Lenglet's sympathies are betrayed is by the choice of texts produced in an 'Addition' of 190 pages which was apparently not included in all copies; here he published a number of texts relating to events in Arras, but also the theses defended at Louvain which Huygens and his colleagues had used as proof of their orthodoxy on the subject of confessions.⁵⁴ It is highly likely that it was from the Jansenists in the Netherlands that Lenglet procured these texts; obviously they were anxious to defend themselves against the renewed accusations of undermining orthodox doctrine on such an important question. One may surmise that this was one of the works referred to in letters between Lenglet and the Quesnel group, which they reviewed before publication. It was undoubtedly to their advantage to have their interests defended in an apparently objective work published in France by a writer who was not publicly marked as sectarian. Lenglet even went to the trouble of getting a privilege and approbation from Paris in order to avoid any problems with the Administration, even though Lille had become enemy territory by the time his work had been printed.⁵⁵

The objectivity of Lenglet's handling of the material is attested by the fact that it got a highly approbatory compte-rendu in the Mémoires de Trévoux, although it must be added that this did not appear until December 1711⁵⁶ at which time Lenglet was working for the Jesuit interests in Tournai. The Traité was republished in 1715.

It is worth noting that in 1722 when Lenglet was imprisoned in Strasbourg and under suspicion of being connected with certain Jansenist

'conspiracies', he asserted that he had written this work in opposition to the Jansenist influence in Arras and Tournai.⁵⁷ In view of his friendly relations with the 'parti' in 1708, and the content of the work, this is patently untrue; it is clear that Lenglet was simply trying to recuperate this period of his life in the eyes of the French Administration. However, of the 'ouvrages' that Lenglet communicated to the Jansenists, as attested by d'Argenson's report, the Traité and possibly the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire,⁵⁸ are the only ones we can identify; it is possible that Lenglet also wrote something in pamphlet form, or collaborated in other works, but of such we have found no trace.

The last publication of this period was an edition of the Histoire de la conquête de la Floride,⁵⁹ by Garcilaso de la Vega el Ynca,⁶⁰ which had been translated and published by Pierre Richelet in 1670. There was a great deal of interest in the writings of de la Vega in eighteenth-century France, not least on the part of Voltaire; they were 'a unique source for knowledge of the Inca civilization[...]', as the Encyclopédie article 'Incas' makes clear.⁶¹ Lenglet retained Richelet's translation, adding a Preface in which he introduced de la Vega and his writings, and mentioned how he had himself been friendly with Richelet in the last two years of the latter's life; he also added a small number of notes to the text. This edition was published in Paris in 1709, and republished with Lenglet's Preface several times. Lenglet did not put his name to his work; one wonders if this was because he still hoped to make his career in the ecclesiastical world, and was prepared to disown his more 'profane' productions.

The eternal opportunist: clergyman or spy?

It was in August 1708 that Prince Eugene of Savoy, at the head of an Austrian army, and the Duke of Marlborough, commander-in-chief of the English forces, encircled and laid siege to the city of Lille; the siege lasted until December of that year, the town and citadel being valiantly, if vainly, defended for the French by the Maréchal de Boufflers.⁶² After the surrender of the city to the allies Lenglet managed to procure an introduction to Eugene, possibly by pretexting Electoral business as is suggested by his 'Mémoire' to Malesherbes,⁶³ but more probably as an expert on rare books. It would appear in effect from letters in Eugene's correspondence that the abbé was presented to the Prince in the latter capacity by one of his officers, the Baron Georg Wilhelm Hohendorff,⁶⁴ himself a bibliophile and owner of a rich personal library. Lenglet offered his services to the Prince as an agent who would help to build up the ~~large~~ collection of books and manuscripts which he was amassing in Vienna. Even in the middle of his campaigns the Prince, who was a highly cultivated man, did not forget his literary interests; he was doubtless impressed by Lenglet's encyclopedic 'connaissances', and accepted his offers. Lenglet fulfilled this function up to the early 1720's in addition to, or sometimes despite, his other dealings with Eugene.

In January 1709 Lenglet travelled to Douai to see the Maréchal de Boufflers, whom he had possibly already met in Lille during the siege. He reported that he had been approached by a certain Jaupain, whom he had met as valet to Ernest Ruth d'Ans in Brussels, and who had since become 'Directeur Général des Postes de la Flandre espagnole'. He acted

as a secret agent for the allied generals, communicating to them any useful information he could gather from letters passing through the post-office in Brussels, and organising a ring of 'correspondants' in strategic positions in France who informed on the movements of the French armies and officials.⁶⁵ Jaupain proposed to Lenglet that he should secretly enter the service of the Allies; he wanted the latter to find suitable correspondants in Douai and Tournai, 'sachant que [il a] dans ces villes la connaissance des gens capables',⁶⁶ and to act as intermediary for the transmission of information from them to himself, Jaupain. Lenglet proposed to Boufflers that he should accept Jaupain's offer, and play double agent, giving him some correct information of minor importance in order to engage his confidence, and then proffering false reports which would lead the enemy astray.⁶⁷ Boufflers felt that Lenglet's services could be useful, as he would be able to bring news of events in occupied Lille under cover of visiting his agents in Douai, and might even succeed in discovering the identity of some of Jaupain's spies in France.⁶⁸ Lenglet's plan was approved by Versailles, and he was promised a Royal pension of 800 livres per annum 'a condition qu'il servira utilement et fidelement'.⁶⁹

In addition, Jaupain promised Lenglet that he and his informers would be paid 'grassement';⁷⁰ the normal fee was 525 florins (the florin was approximately the equivalent of a French livre) per month,⁷¹ amounting to a yearly 'salary' of about 6,000 livres, or three times the royal pension paid to a member of the Académie des Inscriptions. As the Minister in Versailles remarked on receiving this information, 'Il ne serait pas difficile d'en corrompre quelqu'un en les payant aussi chèrement qu'ils font'.⁷² After three months service Lenglet was offered double that fee if he succeeded in corrupting an agent attached to the

service of the Ministers de Chamillart and de Torcy.⁷³ So, if he could keep control of the situation, Lenglet was in a position to make a tidy fortune for the duration of the war, and assure himself a regular, if modest income for the rest of his life.

De Boufflers presented Lenglet as an 'homme de confiance' to two of the Royal Intendants in Flanders, de Bernières and Le Blanc. Lenglet maintained a close contact with them, communicating lengthy reports on his relations with Jaupain, and accounts of his interviews with the latter whenever he came to Lille; they concocted with him the false information he was to convey to Jaupain.⁷⁴ Lenglet was soon able to report that the enemies' network of spies reached even to Versailles;⁷⁵ how many of these he actually succeeded in uncovering is unclear, but he did have one major scoop in June 1709. He discovered from one of Marlborough's letters that a man named Le Grand, 'Capitaine des Portes' at Mons where the Electors of Cologne and Bavaria were residing, was in the pay of the enemy and had plotted to abandon the city to them. Lenglet warned Le Blanc, who took appropriate action; Le Grand was arrested and executed.⁷⁶

Just how long Lenglet's relations with Jaupain lasted we cannot be sure, but there is evidence to suggest they continued for at least a year,⁷⁷ although Jaupain himself claimed it was only three or four months.⁷⁸ Eventually, he began to have doubts about the information he was receiving through Lenglet; he accepted it with caution until he finally received one dispatch 'qui paraissait effectivement dicté par un général ennemi pour nous faire exposer des troupes entre leurs mains'. He showed the document to the Duke of Marlborough, who was thereby convinced of Lenglet's treachery and instructed Jaupain to break off contact with

him. Their certainty of Lenglet's double-dealing was re-inforced at a later date by a letter which Lenglet had written to Quesnel, and which was communicated to Jaupain after Lenglet's split with the Jansenists. Jaupain later reported to Eugene how in this letter Lenglet stated:

Qu'il n'avait pas été traître à la France en me servant d'espion, que tout ce qu'il m'avait écrit et mandé lui avait été dicté par Mr de Boufflers ou par Mr le Blanc Intendant des armées de France, que quand même le père Quesnel trouverait bon de me communiquer sa lettre, je n'oserais m'en vanter, puisqu'il serait de mon intérêt de ne pas faire connaître que j'avais été sa dupe, comme en effet, je ne l'avais fait connaître qu'à Mylord Duc de Marlborough.⁷⁹

Curiously, it was only in 1721 that Eugene learnt this story from Jaupain; it had been deliberately hidden from him by the Baron Hohendorff, partly to avoid the embarrassment of having introduced such a man to the Prince, according to Jaupain's interpretations,⁸⁰ but also most likely because he wanted to continue to use Lenglet's services to the benefit of his own library and that of the Prince. He likewise kept quiet about another 'friponnerie' of Lenglet's in the same year.⁸¹

This account of events, as recorded in Jaupain's letters to Eugene in 1721, is in direct contradiction with the information conveyed by contemporary French sources. Already in July 1710 the Marquis de Torcy described Lenglet in his Journal as an 'homme d'un mauvais caractère, et qui, faisant le métier d'espion pour le maréchal de Boufflers, avait été reconnu par lui pour un fripon'.⁸² In December 1711 M. de Bernières wrote to Paris to inform the Ministry that Lenglet had betrayed him to the enemy, 'dans le temps que je le croyais le plus affectionné à nous servir'.⁸³ According to him, Lenglet reported back to the Allies everything he could learn from his contact with the French Intendants. He also asserts that when Lenglet became aware of de Bernière's distrust, he took revenge by betraying a French secret agent in Lille; and

moreover that it was the abbé who wrote the intelligence reports for the enemy prior to the siege of Tournai, to the success of which he greatly contributed. His overall judgement is that Lenglet 'est homme de beaucoup d'esprit, mais très dangereux'.⁸⁴

Lenglet, in his defence, claimed that these stories had been invented by his enemies in order to blacken his name with de Bernières;⁸⁵ this argument is plausible in view of the fact that the Quesnel group did make active attempts to discredit him with the Allies.⁸⁶ They, or even Jaupain himself, may equally well have used this line of attack in order to reduce his field of activity, or simply out of a spirit of revenge. Lenglet's subsequent career proves that Claude Le Blanc, the person with whom he had closest contact, continued to trust him; even in the summer of 1710, when Lenglet was closely attached to Eugene, he was passing information to Le Blanc.⁸⁷ The strongest evidence in his favour are the Jaupain letters and Eugene's reaction to them in 1721.⁸⁸ Had Lenglet rendered the important services to their side described by de Bernières, it is highly unlikely that these two personages could have been unaware of the fact. It is difficult to make positive assertions, particularly in view of the fact that de Bernière's report gives no dates which would help to situate the alleged crimes; one can only say that given the evidence available, it would seem that the 'friponnerie' of which Lenglet was guilty fell short of overt treason.

It is clear however that the relationships he established or developed in the course of 1710, and particularly that with Eugene, placed him in a highly irregular position vis-à-vis the French government. It would appear that in 1709 and 1710 Lenglet followed Eugene in his campaign: he was at the siege of Tournai in September-October 1709,⁸⁹

and that of Douai in the summer of 1710.⁹⁰ Even if he only went to talk about books, he was de facto a camp-follower of an enemy general.

During this period his book-buying activities attained large proportions, and must have been both time-consuming and reasonably lucrative. In 1711 an inventory of his trunks revealed:

1 ... 18 ou 20 lettres de libraires ou de particuliers concernant des ventes ou achats de livres

2 ... 18 memoires ou listes de livres demandez ou envoyez le tout pour le Prince Eugene de Savoye.⁹¹

One wonders where Lenglet's suppliers were located; undoubtedly much of his trade was with the book-sellers of the Netherlands and Holland who were within reasonable access, but he probably also traded by correspondence with Paris. He made a special trip to that city in July 1710 in order to buy surreptitiously a collection of hand-drawn maps in four large folio volumes which had belonged to the Marquis de Louvois and which the Prince wanted for himself. The Marquis de Torcy, and probably Lenglet, thought erroneously that this collection had been especially drawn at the request and expense of Louis XIV, and was therefore royal property: hence all the secrecy. De Torcy was instructed to arrest Lenglet, and recover the volumes. The latter managed to get back to Tournai before the police found him, leaving the volumes behind 'chez l'abbé du Pin, docteur de Sorbonne', where they were seized by de Torcy some days later.⁹² Apparently the Baron Hohendorff was convinced on this occasion that Lenglet himself had 'tipped-off' the Ministry as to the whereabouts of the maps, no doubt to save his own skin, while coolly pocketing Eugene's money.⁹³ Incidentally, in that same summer the Chancellor Pontchartrain, commissioned Lenglet to present the 'Histoire du Roi par medailles' to Eugene on his behalf:⁹⁴ there appears to be no consistency

in the responses of the various members of the Royal administration to our abbé. But overall his reputation was hardly that of an honest dealer: the Comte d'Argenson, Lieutenant général de police, reported in January 1712:

A legard de sa conduite particuliere il faisoit traficq de toutes sortes de livres et s'estoit fort decréié parce qu'il ne payoit personne.⁹⁵

It is a pity that the inventory mentioned above did not give any details about the type of works Lenglet bought for Eugene.

Up to the middle of 1710 he also maintained a close tie with the Quesnel group. In addition to the letter to Quesnel described by Jaupain in which Lenglet 'prenait conseil sur certaine affaire', the letters intercepted by the Comte d'Argenson likewise date from 1709-1710; they not only showed, as we have seen above, how intimate was Lenglet's relationship with the Jansenists in the 'enemy' countries, but they also offered proof of 'la liaison des jansenistes de hollande avec ceux de France. Il y est parlé en particulier de certains, designez par des noms misterieux'.⁹⁶ Lenglet, with his love of intrigue, may well have played go-between for the exiles and their sympathisers in France. However, their friendship with Lenglet began to come under serious strain early in 1710.

A canonicate became vacant in the Chapter of Tournai at the end of 1709, and Lenglet made the first of many attempts to procure his own nomination. The town having passed into the hands of the Allies, who had also occupied most of the Spanish Netherlands, the obvious strategy was to address himself to their leaders, and to the Jansenists who were in favour with the Dutch government. One obscure reference in his Mémoires sur la collation des canonicats would suggest that Ernest Ruth

d'Ans chose not to apply himself in order to leave the field open to Lenglet;⁹⁷ and the Duke of Marlborough wrote in his favour to the Chapter of Tournai on the 12th January, 1710:

L'Abbé Lenglet du Fresnoi vous étant fortement recommandé par M. le Prince de Savoie et My Lord Albemarle pour le canonicat vacant dans votre chapitre, il me semble fort inutile de vous écrire en sa faveur. Cependant y étant sollicité, et étant très-persuadé de son mérite, j'ai bien voulu ajouter que la grâce que vous lui ferez en cette occasion me sera aussi très-agréable.⁹⁸

Lenglet also procured lettres de naturalité from the Emperor, as it had been decided that only citizens of the Netherlands could be given benefices,⁹⁹ an action which, when it was later discovered, clearly did not improve his standing with the French authorities.

With such powerful patronage Lenglet must have felt pretty certain of success; but the Chapter refused to accept him.¹⁰⁰ One may surmise that they did so on the same grounds as they rejected d'Ans shortly afterwards: primarily, they were totally opposed to any Jansenist influence, and secondly they held that only the bishop of Tournai had the right to bestow the benefice, despite the fact that he had fled to France when the town fell to the Allies.¹⁰¹ In the months which followed Lenglet did not abandon hope; he evidently reached the conclusion that his interests would be better served by associating himself with the bishop of Tournai and the French government, thereby distancing himself from his erstwhile friends in an extraordinary, totally unscrupulous volte-face. In July the Dean of the Cathedral in Tournai died, and this time d'Ans himself sought the nomination; he argued that since the bishop had fled to France and his revenues had been confiscated, he had lost his rights in the matter of the benefices which could therefore be conferred by the States General of Holland, who were administering the affairs of the occupied Netherlands.¹⁰² Lenglet was employed by M. de

Beauveau, bishop of Tournai, to defend his cause; he was almost certainly assured of a benefice for himself if he succeeded in keeping d'Ans out.¹⁰³

Lenglet wrote a series of manuscript 'Mémoires' on the question of defending the Bishop's rights, which were sent to the Hague for the consideration of the States General in August, September and October 1710; at this point d'Ans expressed his annoyance to Lenglet whom he was beginning seriously to mistrust.¹⁰⁴ When Lenglet visited d'Ans in Brussels in November, the latter accused him of playing into the hands of the Jesuits who were a powerful influence in the Chapter and seminary of Tournai.¹⁰⁵ The accusation was well founded, as Lenglet himself admits in his Lettre à l'auteur des Observations sur les écrits modernes in 1739, where he ironically remarks that he had earned the thanks of the Society of Jesus on this occasion - a unique one in his life.¹⁰⁶ D'Ans and his circle made efforts to recuperate Lenglet: the latter claims that when he went to the Hague to solicit the co-operation of Prince Eugene, who as representative of the Holy Roman Empire could exert some influence on his Protestant allies, and to request that all nominations be suspended until the end of the war, Jacques Basnage offered him, on behalf of the States General, a canonicate at Tournai if he would settle the affair in favour of d'Ans. According to his own account of the interview he, of course, piously replied that his interests were unimportant in comparison with those of the Church, and refused the offer.¹⁰⁷ It is much more likely that having failed to get a benefice, even with the backing of the allied Generals, he felt he could do better on the Bishop's side. Certainly some offer was effectively made, but d'Ans speaks in a letter to Lenglet of a priorship, and not of a canonicate; d'Ans advised him to accept this offer, threatening him, if he

failed to do so, with the revelation of certain letters which he had written to members of the Quesnel circle and which would damn him in the eyes of 'ceux qui commandent et qui gouvernent pour les allies'.¹⁰⁸ D'Ans held to his threat; the letters were communicated to the States General. Perhaps the letter described by Jaupain in his correspondence with Prince Eugene in 1721 was one of them?¹⁰⁹ Jaupain does assert that it had been sent to him by Quesnel himself, to whom it had been addressed.

Yet, strangely, Prince Eugene's confidence in Lenglet was not shaken at this time, as only part of these disclosures seem to have reached his ears;¹¹⁰ he took him under his protection with the title of 'aumônier' in his household.¹¹¹ Eugene, and the Count Passionei¹¹² who was at this time acting as secret envoy of the Holy See at the Hague, approved Lenglet's 'Mémoires', but instructed him not to publish them unless the States General forced 'quelque innovation ou quelque violence',¹¹³ on the Chapter of Tournai. When the situation deteriorated in 1711 he was given leave to publish: three out of a series of eight or nine 'Mémoires' were printed in Tournai,¹¹⁴ and Lenglet himself went to the Hague to present them to the States General. Those which he had felt it most urgent to publish were numbered respectively as the 1st, 5th and 6th of the series: the first recounted the circumstances leading up to the nomination of Ruth d'Ans by the States General; the fifth and sixth dealt with problems of ecclesiastical law and church tradition concerning the powers of a bishop whose temporal revenues have been confiscated, and the validity of nominations to benefices made by 'ceux que l'Eglise appelle Hérétiques et Schismatiques', the government of Holland being, of course, Protestant. He used his knowledge of church history to good effect in arguing that

church tradition undoubtedly favoured the position of Bishop Beauveau; even Jacques Fouillou, in a letter to Quesnel, was forced to remark that although Lenglet's Mémoires were 'ce qu'il y a de plus diabolique', nonetheless 'ce qu'il y a de fâcheux c'est que sur le fond de l'affaire il peut mettre la raison de son côté'.¹¹⁵ Fouillou had good reason to be angry: the Preface and first Mémoire contained a virulent personal attack on Ruth d'Ans, whom Lenglet accused of being an unworthy priest because he had served the Allies as an intelligence agent during the war, and a hypocrite who was only acting out of self-interest.¹¹⁶ Lenglet, of course, to complete the irony, placed himself in the role of the totally disinterested ecclesiastic who was working solely for the triumph of truth and the church's reputation. The tone throughout is highly unpleasant, especially when one considers that this attack was directed against a former friend, and a man whose religious conviction and consistency are beyond doubt.

Not surprisingly, the Mémoires were very well received in France; a warmly approbatory review in the Mémoires de Trévoux of May 1712¹¹⁷ opened with the remark:

Monsieur Lenglet employe avec zele et avec force à la défense de la discipline de l'Eglise, le rare talent que Dieu lui a donné d'écrire;

the summary of Lenglet's work which followed was, of course, highly partisan. It is likely that this review was written by the director of the Trévoux journal, René-Joseph Tournemine S.J.,¹¹⁸ who as nephew of the former bishop of Tournai had himself been involved in the affairs of the diocese and had got to know Lenglet there. The tone of the compte-rendu in the Journal des savants was also very favourable, but this was not published until 1715.¹¹⁹

An anonymous defence of the Jansenist position soon appeared in answer to Lenglet's Mémoires; ¹²⁰ it concentrated for the main part on Lenglet's sixth Mémoire which was, it pointed out, an insult to the authority of the ruling States General, and should therefore be suppressed. This was an argument which understandably carried weight with the Dutch government; tired of the opposition to the installation of their nominees, they ordered Lenglet, and the abbé Colbert, Grand-Vicaire, to leave the country. ¹²¹ Lenglet refused to do so, on the grounds that Prince Eugene, to whose service he was attached, had given him orders to the contrary. He was arrested and imprisoned in Lille for approximately six weeks in September-October of this year, 1717; ¹²⁷ it was only at Eugene's express request to the States General that he was finally released. ¹²³

Nevertheless, the opposition of the Molinist party proved strong enough to keep Ruth d'Ans out of the Chapter of Tournai; he never succeeded in taking possession of his Deanship, though he did retain the 'possession civile' which assured him a regular income. ¹²⁴ De Beauveau remained as titular bishop of Tournai up to the Treaty of Utrecht, when the seat passed definitely under Austrian control; he was given the diocese of Toulouse in compensation. ¹²⁵ But Lenglet, for all his efforts and betrayals, got no reward from church or state in France, a fact which gave him subject for bitter complaint on many occasions. He does state in later life that 'M. de Beauveau lui voulut donner une pension sur son propre bien', but he refused, 'ne voulant rien recevoir, que de l'Eglise ou du Roy'; ¹²⁶ his hopes of being accepted into the church Establishment were once again dashed.

Political disgrace and literary success

Shortly after his release from prison Lenglet made up his mind to return to his homeland, no doubt because he had little left to gain from the allied powers. But the reputation he had acquired among the French representatives in Flanders as an 'homme très suspect' preceded him to Paris: two of the Intendants in the province, de Bernage and de Bernières, wrote to warn Versailles of his arrival;¹²⁷ as we have seen, de Bernières was convinced that Lenglet had betrayed the French interests. Lenglet was however forewarned of what awaited him, probably by Le Blanc, and took action to forestall his arrest. Having arrived in Paris without a passport on or about the 11th December, he asked the abbé Colbert to write to the Comte d'Argenson, Lieutenant général de Police, on his behalf. Colbert transmitted Lenglet's contention that he had been obliged to take the title of 'aumônier' to Prince Eugene in order to protect himself against the States General in the Tournai affair, and that he was innocent of any 'intelligence avec les Ennemis'. He stated that Lenglet was ready to answer all charges against him, and had expressed his willingness to retire to any seminary the minister might choose until his name had been cleared. Nonetheless, the terms of the abbé Colbert's defence are prudent and measured, and suggest that he did not himself have total confidence in Lenglet:

Je vous supplie d'être persuadé, Monseigneur, que la seule Charité, et les Talens que Je Luy Connois m'engagent aujourd'huy de vous faire cette priere En son nom, quoique je l'aye connu de Tres bonnes meurs, Je ne Voudrois pas me rendre caution de son Innocence, dieu seul connoit le fond des Coeurs.¹²⁸

The letter had the desired effect, however: Lenglet's trunks were held at the customs, but he was not arrested. He paid a visit to the Comte d'Argenson, and agreed with him that he would retire for a time to the seminary of Saint Nicolas du Chardonnet at Villejuif. In the meantime

his trunks were examined, and a brief description of his letters and papers drawn up.¹²⁹ The most compromising documents were the 30 letters from Ruth d'Ans and Fouillou mentioned above, 3 from a certain 'Sr. Desertes', likewise a 'fameux Janseniste fugitif et sorti du Royaume contre les ordres du Roy',¹³⁰ and the minutes of 3 letters by Lenglet, one to Desertes, one to Fouillou, and the third to Eugene. These proved, as we have seen, that Lenglet was at one time a close associate of the Quesnel group; but they also bore evidence to the fact that d'Ans and Fouillou had indeed attempted to blackmail Lenglet with the letters he had previously written to them, and which could be used against him. D'Argenson quotes a passage where Fouillou pointed out to Lenglet 'le besoin ou il est de dissiper tous les soubçons que Mr de Bernieres a eu, de sa conduite'. Was this too a veiled warning? Unfortunately, we do not have the full text of the letters, d'Argenson's notes being very summary, and so cannot affirm what Fouillou's intentions in the matter were; nevertheless, the various threats expressed do add to the plausibility of Lenglet's defence. The latter consistently claimed in letters to d'Argenson that his enemies had deliberately blackened his name with de Bernières, and he asked that Le Blanc, an eye-witness of the events in which he took part, should be called to testify in his favour.¹³¹ When d'Argenson finally interrogated Lenglet in May 1712, he reached the conclusion that his conduct had been highly ambiguous, but not overtly treacherous:

*Si ses intentions secretes ont esté pour les interets de la France, il ne peut dezavouer que ses demarches exterieures ne leur ayent esté fort contraires et mesme tres reprehensibles suivant le droit de la guerre [...] qu'enfin s'il a merité que quelques uns de Mrs les generaux des armées de France rendissent de bons temoignages en sa faveur, ses engagements dans le party Ennemy peuvent exciter contre luy de justes soubçons et faire conclure qu'un homme tel que celuy la ne doit pas estre absolument laissé sur sa foy dans la capitale du Royaume jusqu'a la paix.*¹³²

Accordingly he was allowed to remain in the seminary; the directors re-

ported that he lived 'fort regulierement',¹³³ and he himself afterwards wrote to Passionei that he had spent 'dix mois fort tranquille à Paris'.¹³⁴ He was evidently content to live a retired life, devoting himself to his own work. During this period he managed to arrange for the publication of what was to be his most famous work, the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire.¹³⁵ The approbation was signed by the censor in April 1712, though the book did not actually appear until 1713; it was anonymous, which is not surprising given Lenglet's position at the time: it is unlikely that a man under suspicion of treason would have been allowed to put his name to any such publication.

In its original form, the Méthode consisted of two volumes in duodecimo: the first contained 21 chapters in which Lenglet developed a methodology for the study of history, addressed to an educated but non-specialist public; the second was made up of two essays by Saint-Réal and Saint-Evremond, and a 342 page 'Catalogue des principaux historiens'. In his Preface, Lenglet surveys earlier methodologies for the study of history: he points out that many supposed 'Méthodes' were in reality 'des traitez de Religion, de Politique ou de Philosophie' whose authors were only interested in using historical material to illustrate their own systems of thought. Others were simply abridged histories which did not attempt to formulate principles which could guide the student in his further research. Some writers, such as Jean Bodin, had indeed attempted to develop a methodology; a number of such works were useful to Lenglet in the preparation of his own Méthode, but most were by now outdated as there had been so many developments in the field of criticism over the past century. Lenglet remarks that the most recent of these treatises was an Introduction à la lecture de l'Histoire published by the Jesuit Claude-François Menestrier in 1694,¹³⁶ but it does not have either 'l'étendue

nécessaire, ni les principes suffisans pour conduire dans l'étude de l'Histoire Universelle, ou des Histoires particulières'. It is clearly in providing these principles of criticism that he sees the significance of his own work. In conclusion, Lenglet once again defends himself for preferring Protestant writers to Catholic ones when the former are superior in scholarly terms:

Un esprit juste[...]se donne bien de garde de transferer à une qualité du coeur l'éloge qu'on attribue seulement à une certaine qualité de l'esprit.

In the body of the work, he explains the necessity of mastering complementary disciplines such as geography and chronology as a prelude to the serious study of history. There follows a guide to the study of 'particular' histories, starting in traditional order with sacred and classical history, moving on to the European nations, and, more summarily, to the other continents. Lenglet examines under each heading the best works available on the subject, and makes suggestions as to the order and method to be adopted in dealing with them. He extends his remarks to the history of certain institutions, such as the religious and military Orders, to that of the royal families in Europe, and to the arts and sciences. The last third of the treatise is devoted to a discussion of the primary source materials available to the historian, in which Lenglet underlines the progress made by the seventeenth-century érudits in the publication of charters, inscriptions etc.; to an exposition of the critical principles to be applied in reading works of history, in relation to both the historian and his material; and to some elements of textual criticism. The Catalogue des historiens classifies under headings which correspond largely to the central chapters of the treatise the most important works available, with brief critical remarks. The criteria applied in the choice of entries are not at all clear; under many headings Lenglet simply noted all the

titles he could find.

The Méthode had a strange publishing history from the start. What was generally assumed to be the first edition (Paris, 1713) was soon followed by a supposedly 'pirate' edition published in Brussels early in 1714, this time with the author's name on the title-page.¹³⁷ The text of the first volume contained quite a large number of minor additions. Some of these were personal attacks on other writers, or satirical remarks, such as one on Saint Ignatius Loyola which is reminiscent of the Traité sur les apparitions; the longest passages were remarks of a political nature which would have been offensive to nations whose friendship the French government was cultivating, and which included several anti-Jesuit sallies.¹³⁸ The reading-public generally supposed that the publishers were responsible for these additions, and Lenglet himself loudly disclaimed them, even before their appearance, protesting that 'elles sont et contre ses principes, et contre ses propres connaissances'.¹³⁹ But what was really strange was the disappearance of other important and relevant passages which had been included in the Paris edition.¹⁴⁰ An article in Le Journal Littéraire criticised the Brussels publishers for their conduct in the matter,¹⁴¹ but the editor of the journal inserted a note correcting the writer and giving the true history of the publication:

L'Edition de Bruxelles, qu'on regarde ici comme une copie falsifiée, etc. est proprement l'Edition originale, particulièrement du premier Volume, qui contient la Méthode pour étudier l'Histoire. L'Auteur en fit commencer l'impression en Hollande, et la fit achever à Bruxelles, par des Libraires à qui il devoit aussi donner le Catalogue. Mais, étant ensuite allé en France, il fit imprimer à Paris les deux Volumes ensemble. Si l'Auteur a trouvé à propos d'y changer, et même de retrancher plusieurs choses, qu'il avoit mises dans le premier Volume, lors qu'il étoit encore aux Pays-Bas, ce n'est pas la faute des Libraires de Bruxelles.¹⁴²

This information given by the Dutch journalists helps to clarify the

early history of the Méthode; it is evident that the manuscript was ready for publication, and given to a printer in Holland, by 1711 at the latest. It was possibly when the crisis over the Tournai affair came to a head that Lenglet transferred the publication to the Netherlands, although this may simply have been due to an arrangement between booksellers, as the work was published by a 'Compagnie de libraires'. In any event, before the printing of the first volume was finished, or that of the second started, Lenglet was imprisoned in Lille and forced to flee to France. He then decided it was in his best interests to publish the whole work in his home country; so the publishers in Brussels were left with what was probably an unfinished first volume, and no Catalogue. Lenglet made a number of changes and suppressions to suit the different political climate: as one Dutch journalist remarked, 'l'on peut croire que M. Langlet a eu de fortes raisons pour ne pas tenir en France le même langage qu'en Hollande et à Bruxelles'.¹⁴³ In revising his text he also made a number of additions, while other amendments were apparently forced on him by the censor; these were in the Catalogue, and were in the main satirical gibes, for example at the expense of the regular clergy whom he despised.¹⁴⁴ It was only after the work made its appearance in Paris that the publishers in Brussels were able to complete their own edition, copying the Catalogue in its censored version as it had been adapted for a French public.

The success of the Méthode was immediate; the censor, Claude Gros de Boze, commented 'il m'a paru que cet ouvrage est un des meilleurs que nous ayons en ce genre',¹⁴⁴ and all subsequent critics were basically in agreement. The Mémoires de Trévoux¹⁴⁵ gave a lengthy summary of the work of this 'judicieux Auteur'; they apparently accepted the excuse offered by Lenglet for 'peu de reflexions qui ne sont pas trop dévotes',

namely that they were the fault of those who produced the first edition 'faite en Hollande'.¹⁴⁵ He is criticised, but mildly, on only two counts: firstly for the way in which he applied a rule of criticism taken from the Logique de Port-Royal, anathema to the Jesuits, to the history of Jeanne d'Arc; secondly for accepting the 'regles établies par les nouveaux Critiques' with regard to the verification of texts.¹⁴⁷

The Catalogue is likewise praised:

Une grande connaissance des livres, talent qui distingue l'Auteur, a rendu ces catalogues plus exacts, que tous ceux qui ont paru jusqu'à present.¹⁴⁸

The compte-rendu in the Journal des savants in the same year was likewise highly approbatory in tone.¹⁴⁹ A commentary on the Brussels edition in the Journal littéraire of 1714 was more critical,¹⁵⁰ and took Lenglet to task for his bias in favour of France: the writer remarked that almost a third of the Catalogue was devoted to its history, and even the text was unbalanced in the amount of attention focussed on countries according to whether they were allies of France or not. They singled out remarks Lenglet had made to the disadvantage of Austria and Holland, who of course were still at war with France when he wrote the work. But despite these drawbacks, the journalist's overall estimation was again favourable:

On peut dire, qu'en général son Livre est très bon et très instructif, et ne laisse pas d'être méthodique, quoi qu'il y ait, par-ci par-là, de petits écarts sur des matieres qui ne font rien au dessein de l'Auteur.¹⁵¹

The weaknesses in the Catalogue pointed out by the above critic soon began to be remedied. Lenglet stated in his Preface that the first edition was simply an 'essai' to be improved with time; he welcomed the criticisms and suggestions offered by 'divers Sçavans', among whom figured a certain 'M. Salmon, Docteur de Sorbonne'.¹⁵² But the chief contributions were made by the editors of versions published abroad, which soon began to proliferate. The first was a French edition

published in Leipzig of which the first volume followed the text of the Paris edition even in its pagination, with the addition of a few corrective notes;¹⁵³ the Catalogue, however, was augmented by 100 pages. It was produced by Jean-Burckhard Mencke, 'Conseiller et Historiographe de Sa Maj.Pol'.¹⁵⁴ In his Preface, Mencke gave an interesting account of the success of the Méthode in his country:

Ce livre imprimé à Paris l'année precedente, me tomba entre les mains quelques temps après. En le lisant j'y trouvai un si bel ordre, tant de savoir et d'erudition, sans parler du beau langage qui y regne, que je ne pus m'empêcher d'en recommander la lecture à mes amis; ensuite ils en parlerent à d'autres. Voilà ce livre en peu de jours estimé et fort recherché, de sorte que les exemplaires qui s'en trouvoient ici, ne suffisant point pour contenter le public, j'en parlai à un Marchand Libraire aussi renommé que sage qui écouta ma proposition, et resolut de le faire réimprimer à condition que je voulusse bien me donner la peine de l'augmenter et de le corriger dans les endroits, où il seroit besoin de le faire.

Mencke added that he had corrected many errors in the Catalogue, and remedied a large number of omissions, particularly in the sections on German, English and Italian works; his additions were distinguished by an obelisk. He had also decided to change the arrangement of certain chapters in the Catalogue, as their order had been dictated by the author's national partiality rather than any internal logic. A German translation of this edition appeared in Leipzig in 1718.

In 1716 the Méthode was translated into Italian by Apostolo Zeno.¹⁵⁵ His translation was based on Mencke's edition, and he in his turn augmented both the text and the Catalogue, particularly the article relating to Italian history ; he also added a dissertation on medals and inscriptions by Count Scipione Maffei.¹⁵⁶ The work was, it would appear, banned in Rome, but the translator finally succeeded in having it published in Venice.¹⁵⁷ This edition, with the dissertation, was in turn translated into English by Richard Rawlinson, and published in London in 1728.¹⁵⁸

The degree of popularity of the work is amply demonstrated by the number and variety of reeditions; already in September 1714 Lenglet inserted a notice in the Mémoires de Trévoux announcing that he himself was preparing a new edition 'afin de satisfaire le Public, qui paraissait le demander toujours avec le même empressement'. He expressed gratitude to Mencke, accepting his criticism with uncharacteristic docility:

L'Auteur lui sçait bon gré de l'avoir relevé dans des occasions où il n'a pas été assez exact, et il profitera avec plaisir et avec reconnoissance des Lumieres qu'il a répandues sur cette partie de son ouvrage.

The new augmented edition was to be in four volumes, and would include 'des tables chronologiques generales et particulieres de tous les Royaumes';¹⁵⁹ but it was in fact many years before Lenglet's plans were brought to fruition.

In the meantime, Lenglet's retreat in the seminary came to an end; in October the priests complained that his board had never been paid by the Ministry, and that the abbé himself had affirmed he could not afford to pay his own way.¹⁶⁰ The Administration proved unwilling to bear the costs of maintaining such a man as a 'guest of the King' in rural retirement, so d'Argenson adopted the expedient solution of sending him into exile.¹⁶¹ Lenglet, who by this time seems to have developed something of a persecution complex, wrote a completely erroneous account of events to Passionei:

Les Jansenistes des Pays Bas chagrins de laisser en repos un homme qui leur était si contraire cherchèrent à surprendre la Religion du Ministre, et ils se donnèrent tant de mouvements que je fus exilé hors du Royaume au mois d'octobre 1712.¹⁶²

There is no evidence to indicate that the Jansenists intervened in any way on the question of his expulsion. He was ordered to go to Nancy;

the Ministry wrote to the Intendant in Metz on 6th November, 1712, to check on whether the abbé had followed the itinerary laid down for him.¹⁶³ A month later M. de Saint-Contest replied that Lenglet had not yet turned up either in Metz or in Nancy.¹⁶⁴

Nonetheless Lenglet does assert that he spent his period of exile in Lorraine,¹⁶⁵ though where exactly he does not indicate. He may well have used it as a base, from whence he travelled to other European cities to conduct his business; he certainly turned up at the peace conference in Utrecht in 1712-1713.¹⁶⁶ What exactly brought him there we cannot know; since he was already out of favour with the French government it is doubtful that he would have dared accept work from any of the diplomats at the conference, either on the Austrian or the French side. But he presumably saw Eugene and the other Austrian ministers there, and also renewed his acquaintance with Count Passionei who had been sent to Utrecht as papal legate. It is supposedly at this time that Lenglet assisted at the interviews between the Prince and Passionei which he describes in the Dedication of his Tablettes chronologiques,¹⁶⁷ and in which Eugene 'se confirmait dans ce tendre amour pour les livres, source infaillible de plaisirs purs dans la prospérité, et ressource assurée de consolation dans l'adversité'. No doubt the clever and lively young Italian nobleman was eager to impress the famous general with his learning and culture; the reputation of a 'man of letters' was one he dearly coveted.¹⁶⁸ This was an ideal opportunity for Lenglet to make his talents as a 'literary agent' known to Passionei, as he could vaunt the services he had already rendered to Eugene; from this point of view his visit to Utrecht was probably a fairly profitable one.

Sometime around January 1714 the Chancellor Voysin sent Lenglet permission to return to France. He spent a few weeks in Paris, and then set off to Lille 'pour y régler quelques affaires domestiques';¹⁶⁹ that city had, of course, been returned to France at the end of the war. While he was there, he heard that the Deanship of St. Pierre de Lille had fallen vacant in a month when the conferral was theoretically reserved to the Papacy. One Papal nomination had already been refused by the chapter; Lenglet therefore seized the opportunity and wrote to Passionei in Rome asking for his support in applying to the Pope for the benefice. He offered to fight for the Papal rights in the matter as he had done in the Tournai affair:

Oserais-je vous assurer, Monseigneur, que je suis en Etat de les faire valoir mieux que personne [...] Si je prends la liberté de faire cette demande, soyez persuadé, Monseigneur, que ce n'est point tant à cause du zèle que j'ai témoigné pour le St Siège, que pour lui rendre encore d'autres services, soit en rétablissant les droits de sa Sainteté sur ce Benéficé, soit en m'opposant dans cette ville et dans le Diocèse de Tournay au Jansénisme qui cherche à s'y fortifier de plus en plus.¹⁷⁰

We do not have Passionei's reply to this letter, but nothing came of Lenglet's solicitations.

Nothing daunted, five months later he again wrote to Rome, this time to ask for a Canonicate in St. Pierre de Lille; obviously the friends he still had in that Chapter were keeping him closely informed of all vacancies.¹⁷¹ Passionei was acting as Papal legate at the conference of Baden; Lenglet addressed him a second letter there in August,¹⁷² and finally seems to have decided to go there in person. He was no doubt also eager to see Prince Eugene, who was likewise attending the conference. Apparently Eugene refused to see him on this occasion, or so the Prince claims in a conversation with J.-B. Rousseau in 1722 which may well have been coloured by his anger of the moment.¹⁷³ The abbé's

overtures to Passionei bore no more fruit than his previous requests. Although Lenglet and the Count, later Cardinal, Passionei remained in close correspondence up to the time of the former's death, the powerful Italian never seems to have made any serious effort to procure for Lenglet the source of revenue he had so desperately hoped for from the church. Arrogant and highhanded, Passionei did not easily render services even to men of reputation whom he could accept in his social sphere. Lionel Gossman has pointed out that he treated his French secretary, a learned and intelligent, if penniless man, very much as he would treat his cook, dismissing him without a second thought after years of devoted service.¹⁷⁴ He was happy to avail himself of Lenglet's services as a literary agent and as a clever and witty reporter of events in Paris, responding occasionally to the abbé's requests for information or help from Rome in the preparation of his works; but it is clear that the noble Italian did not feel himself bound by ties of friendship or gratitude to advance the career of a man whom he undoubtedly regarded as a bourgeois adventurer.

Disappointed once again, Lenglet seems to have temporarily abandoned his hopes of being granted a living in the bosom of the church. He returned to Paris and took up the threads of his life there after an almost continual absence of ten years; during that period he had developed a network of contacts stretching over Western Europe, and established his reputation as a librarian, bibliographer and historian of no mean ability. For this we have the testimony of J.B. Mencke, who, writing in Leipzig in 1714, describes him as:

un homme si docte et si bien versé dans la connoissance de tous les bons livres, que son Altesse le Prince EUGENE, ce heros de nôtre siecle, l'a choisi préferablement à beaucoup d'autres pour lui dresser sa belle Bibliotheque. C'est aussi ce qui lui a sans doute donné occasion de parvenir a la connoissance de beaucoup de livres.¹⁷⁵

The name Lenglet was also undoubtedly becoming well-known to a learned public in France.

It would appear from what we have seen of Lenglet's book-trading activities, and the terms of his agreement with Jaupain who paid him, at the very least, a sum in excess of 6,000 livres, that he must have returned to France with substantial savings to his credit. Yet he claimed to be penniless during his stay at Saint Nicolas du Chardonnet; the wily Lenglet had clearly chosen to put his funds to other uses. It is perhaps more than a coincidence that his sister Marguerite invested capital sums of a little over 10,000 livres between 13th February, 1714, and 20th March, 1715, which sums were to form a significant part of her dowry when she married Nicolas' associate de la Barre in 1719.¹⁷⁶ Lenglet maintained a close and affectionate contact with Marguerite throughout his life, though his own frugal style of living was in marked contrast with her ever-increasing wealth and opulence. It seems likely then that part of the 'fortune' he earned in the Netherlands may have been donated towards the dowries which bought an entry into the robe class for Marguerite and his second sister, Marie Jeanne. Lenglet himself did, in later life, have a regular income of at least 500 livres per annum from rentes, for which he may also have invested the capital at this time.¹⁷⁷

But if his period abroad had brought some financial and literary success, it is clear that Lenglet's reputation must have suffered untold harm vis-à-vis the political administration. An aura of dishonesty and double-dealing would henceforth be attached to his name, and although the administrators might still be willing to exploit his

undoubted 'talents' in some of their more dubious areas of activity, he would hope in vain for any secure, respectable charge or function from the royal bounty. Needless to remark, he was not granted the pension which had been promised to him in 1709 on condition that he faithfully serve the King's interests.

Notes to Chapter II

1. The war had started in 1701.
2. See Alfred Lombard, L'abbé Du Bos, un initiateur de la pensée moderne (1670-1742), Paris, Hachette, 1913, pp.97 ff.
3. See Chapter I above, p.13 and note 43.
4. Archives du Service Historique de l'Armée de Terre (formerly Archives de la Guerre, which title will be used in subsequent references), A 2149, document no.134.
5. See Nouv.acq.franç.3344, f.48: this is a 'Mémoire' by Lenglet entitled 'Services que l'Abbé Lenglet Dufresnoy a rendu a la Religion, a l'Etat et au Roy', which he presented to M. de Malesherbes in 1754.
6. J.T. Dupont-White asserts that Lenglet did indeed owe his employment to Dubos, but does not give the source of his information (Mélanges historiques, p.ciii). Jean-Baptiste Dubos, Lenglet's elder by four years, was also the son of a Beauvais merchant, and it is highly likely that he knew the latter's family during his early years in that city. His career offers another interesting example of the writer trying to make a living in the diplomatic world. (See Lombard, op.cit.)
7. Nouv.acq.franç.3344, f.48.
8. De Torcy's comments on Lenglet in his Journal would suggest that he did not know him: see Frédéric Masson (ed.), Journal inédit de Jean-Baptiste Colbert, Marquis de Torcy, Ministre et Secrétaire d'Etat des Affaires Etrangères pendant les années 1709, 1710 et 1711, Paris, Plon, 1884, pp.231-2.
9. In the Archives du Ministère des Affaires Etrangères, Corr.Pol., Cologne, vols. 57 and 58, there are several letters from the Baron de Karg to the French court written in Lenglet's hand; they date from the period Sep. 1705 to May 1707.
10. See Arch. de la Guerre, A¹ 2149, no.134, for Lenglet's account of his functions in the Karg household.
11. See Antoine Gachet d'Artigny, Nouveaux mémoires d'histoire, de critique, et de littérature, Paris, Debure l'aîné, 1749-56, i, 346 and 453. The notes in this volume were written by Lenglet (cf. Chapter V below, p.289).
12. 1660-1732; he produced good editions of many important historical texts, including the Mémoire de Comines which Lenglet himself later re-edited.
13. See Arch. de la Guerre, A¹ 2149, no.134.
14. See Correspondance de Fénelon, ed. Jean Orcibal, Paris, Klincksieck, 1972, ii, 520.

15. P.193; Lenglet states that he met Fénelon's nephew, the Comte de Laval, there.
16. In De l'Usage des romans Lenglet describes him as 'Le Héros de la vertu et de la probité, le plus beau génie et la plus belle ame, la plus lumineuse, la plus droite, la plus sage que j'aie connue, le coeur le plus parfait que notre siècle ait vû [...] Il est le seul à qui je voulusse prodiguer tous ces caracteres dont je suis avare pour tous les autres.' (i, 275-6)
17. Lettre d'un chanoine de Lille à un docteur de Sorbonne: see Bibliography, 7.01.
18. Dictionnaire de biographie française, Paris, Letouzey et Ané, 1933-, xi, 43 (abbreviated as Dict.de biog.franç. in subsequent references).
19. Lettre d'un chanoine, p.6.
20. P.11.
21. Cf. Dreux du Radier, L'Europe illustrée, v, article on 'Lenglet du Fresnoy'.
22. Cf. Biog.univers., iii, 224-5.
23. Gustave Lanson, 'Origines et premières manifestations de l'esprit philosophique dans la littérature française', Revue des cours et conférences, xvii (Nov. 1908-Mar. 1909), 61 ff.
24. See Nouveaux mémoires, i, 324, note by Lenglet, and ibid. p.461n, where he states: 'Si Mr. Bayle avait encore vécu 6 mois il venait en France avec une pension de 6,000 L. C'étoit M. le Marquis de Torci qui avait fait négocier cette affaire. C'est ce que j'ay su de M. Jacques Basnage'. Elisabeth Labrousse in her biography of Bayle (Pierre Bayle, Nijhoff, the Hague, 1963, i) does not mention any such attempts on the part of either Bayle or the French authorities to negotiate a return to France: the declining state of the philosopher's health would, moreover, have made any such move highly unlikely. Basnage, nonetheless, was a reliable source: although Lenglet may have exaggerated the account at a distance of 47 years, it seems probable that the Minister did speak to him of some such efforts on the part of persons in France.
25. Nouveaux mémoires, i, 223n.
26. Méthode pour étudier l'histoire, 1729 ed., i, 188.
27. Ibid., p.121.
28. Ibid., iii, 90.
29. See above Chapter I, p.28.
30. In Preface, Méthode pour étudier l'histoire, 1713 ed.

31. In his Plan de l'histoire de la monarchie française Lenglet quotes from a letter Basnage had written to him (iii, 339).
32. Catalogue librorum, in vario genere insignium...Quibus utebatur Celeberrimus vir, D. Jacobus Basnagius, Eques, Ecclesiae Haganae Pastor fidelissimus, The Hague, Swart, 1724. Item no.42 (p.55) is Lenglet's Secret de la Confession, and no.475 (p.72) is the Brussels (1714) edition of the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire.
33. Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc, i, xxi.
34. Traité sur les apparitions, i, 239.
35. Jeanne d'Arc, i, xx-xxi. Antoinette de Bourignon (1616-80), a highly eccentric visionary and mystic, had lived for some time in Holland; the sect of her followers made some progress there, and also in Scotland. (See Biog.univers., v, 323-4).
36. Jean-Henri Wettstein (1649-1726), born in Bâle, had established himself in Amsterdam where his bookshop, according to Chauffepié, 'fournit pendant plus de 70 ans à l'Europe entière les meilleures éditions de tout ce qu'il y avait de plus curieux dans la littérature ancienne et moderne'. (See Nouvelle biographie générale, ed. Dr. Hoefer, Paris, Didot, 1857, xlvi, 694).
37. Traité sur les apparitions, i, 290-1.
38. D'Ans (1653-1728) had been exiled twice from the Spanish Netherlands, despite the protection of the Elector of Bavaria, Governor-General of the province; he succeeded in recovering his canonicate in Brussels only after the Austrians took over in 1706. He constantly refused to abjure his convictions, despite the pressures to which he was subjected by the Archbishop of Malines in his last illness. He was refused the Last Sacraments and the right to a church burial. (Biographie nationale de la Belgique, Brussels, Buggenhoudt, 1866, i, 319-23).
39. There were undoubtedly a number of notable Jansenists attached to the Chapter of St. Pierre de Lille, such as, for example, Jacques Duforest (1673-1752), friend of Ruth d'Ans, who was finally expelled from the diocese in 1740. (See Edouard Hautcoeur, Histoire de l'église collégiale et du chapitre de Saint Pierre de Lille, Lille, Quarré, 1896-9, iii, 146 ff., and also L. Mahieu, Jansénisme et antijansénisme dans le diocèse de Boulogne-sur-Mer et de Tournai, Lille, 1948, p.66.
40. See Arch. de la Guerre, A¹ 2149, no.134.
41. Ibid. The personage in question could be either Dreux Louis Dugué de Bagnols (1645-1709), whose father Guillaume had been the benefactor and protector of Port-Royal, and who became Intendant in the Spanish Netherlands in 1701 (Dict.de biog.franç., xi, 1508 and 1509), or one of his sons, whose death is noted in the Nouvelles ecclésiastiques, année 1743, p.196, and who had been successively testamentary executor of such renowned Jansenists as Quesnel, François de Pâris and Soanen, bishop of Senez.

42. Fouillou (1670-1736) left France to join Quesnel in Holland in 1705. He was involved in a long controversy with Fénelon, against whom he published 9 or 10 works, chief among which was his Justification du silence respectueux. He also edited the first 8 volumes of Arnauld's correspondence. He was allowed to return to France after Quesnel's death (Biog.univers., xiv, 498).
43. Arch. de la Guerre, A¹ 2413, no.35.
44. Ibid., no.36.
45. See Lenglet's note in the Nouveaux mémoires, i, 331. On the circumstances surrounding the publication of the Avis see Labrousse, Pierre Bayle, i, 219-21.
46. Arch. de la Guerre, A¹ 2149, no.134.
47. Ibid.
48. Nouv.acq.franç.3344, f.48.
49. Pp.2162-3.
50. See Bibliography, 8.01.
51. Cf. Nouv.acq.franç.3344, f.52.
52. See Lenglet's Preface.
53. For an account of the Louvain affair see Léon Honoré, Le Secret de la confession. Etude historico-canonique, Bruges, Beyaert, 1924, pp.98 ff.
54. These theses are reprinted from Lenglet's edition by Honoré, ibid.
55. Lenglet boasts of this fact in a Mémoire presented to Marshal Boufflers: see Arch. de la Guerre, A¹ 2149, no.134. The censor was apparently the abbé Bignon, with whom Lenglet was connected after his return to France, c. 1720.
56. Pp.2081-98. See also Les Nouvelles littéraires, i(1715), 50 and Le Journal des savants, 1715, pp.241-6.
57. Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 140, ff. 336-7.
58. See below, pp.22 ff.
59. See Bibliography.
60. The original title was La Florida del Ynca. Historia del adelantado Hernando de Soto ... y de otros heroicos cavalleros espanoles é indios, escrita por el Ynca Garcilasso de La Vega, Lisbon, Crasbeeck, 1605.

61. Richard A. Brooks, 'Voltaire and Garcilaso de la Vega', Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, xxx, 190.
62. See Gaston Zeller, Les Temps modernes (Histoire des relations internationales, iii), ii, 91, and Lenglet's Plan de l'histoire de la monarchie française, iii, 334 ff., where he asserts that he was present in Lille during the siege; cf. also the anecdotes he recounts in De l'Usage des romans, i, 63-73;
63. Nouv.acq.franç.3344, f. 48.
64. Staatsarchiv, Belgien, DD 136 b1/2: letters addressed to Eugene by Jaupain, dated 18.11.1721 and 16.12.1721, in which he expresses the belief that it was Hohendorff 'qui lui [à Lenglet] avait procuré la connaissance de V.A.S'. On Hohendorff (1670-1719) see Neue Deutsche Biographie, Duncker and Humblot, Berlin, 1952-, ix, 478-9.
65. Arch. de la Guerre, A¹ 2149, no.134.
66. Ibid., no.111.
67. Ibid., no.108.
68. Ibid.
69. Ibid., no.121.
70. Ibid., no.111.
71. Ibid., A¹ 2154, no.77.
72. Ibid., no.89.
73. Ibid., A¹ 2155, no.29.
74. Ibid., A¹ 2154, no.77, and A¹ 2155, no.28, no.64, etc.
75. Ibid., A¹ 2155, no.29.
76. See Lenglet's account in Nouv.acq.franç.3344, f. 48; references to the treason of Le Grand can be found in the Arch. de la Guerre, A¹ 2135, no.441, and in the correspondence of the Marquise d'Huxelles, Museum Calvet, Avignon, ms.1420, f. 128, though Lenglet is not mentioned by either of these sources. Cf. also Michault, Mémoires, p.30.
77. Marlborough wrote a letter of recommendation for Lenglet in January 1710 (see p.70 below). He was evidently not informed of Lenglet's double-dealing until after this date.
78. In his letter to Eugene of 18.11.1721 (Staatsarchiv, Belgien, DD 136 b1/2) Jaupain stated that Lenglet had received three monthly payments of 50 pistoles (c. 500 livres) before he began to mistrust him; but it is likely that he was trying to minimise his own error of judgement in Eugene's eyes. Similarly Jaupain asserted that 'ce n'a pas été moi qui l'ait induit à cela, mais qu'il s'est venus offrir à moi de son propre mouvement pour me

servir en cette qualité [d'espion]', whereas the letters in the Archives de la Guerre indicate the contrary. One may fairly surmise that Jaupain paid Lenglet monthly over a period of approx. 1 year.

79. Staatsarchiv, Belgien, DD 136 b1/2, Jaupain to Eugene 18.11.1721.

80. Ibid.

81. See below, p. 68.

82. Journal inédit de Jean-Baptiste Colbert, ed. Frédéric Masson, P.232.

83. Arch. de la Guerre, A¹ 2309, no.183.

84. Ibid., A¹ 2311, no.200.

85. See Ibid., A¹ 2411, no.85, and A¹ 2413, no.201.

86. See below pp.71-2.

87. See his Plan de l'histoire de la monarchie française, iii, 341.

88. Cf. below Chapter III, pp.128-9.

89. Lenglet affirms his presence at Tournai in vol. iii, 338 (cancellandum) of the uncensored copies of the Monarchie française (see Bibliography, 59.01).

90. See Monarchie française, iii, p.341, where Lenglet recounts a conversation he had with Marlborough's First Secretary 'au siège de Douai', and also p.351. He also mentions anecdotes concerning Eugene which he witnessed in 1710 in De l'Usage des romans, i, 67-8.

91. Arch. de la Guerre, A¹ 2413, no.183. Already in 1710 de Torcy described Lenglet as an 'ecclésiastique, faisant le métier de savant et de connaisseur en livres' (Journal, p.231).

92. See de Torcy's account of the affair in his Journal, pp.231-2 and 243. Louis Ellies Dupin (1657-1719) was a renowned scholar and theologian; his mammoth Nouvelle bibliothèque des auteurs ecclésiastiques was attacked by Bossuet for many errors of dogma, such as undermining the veneration of the Virgin and the primacy of the Papacy. He was an opponent of the Bull Unigenitus and signed the Cas de conscience. (Biog.univers., xii, 1-4).

93. See Jaupain's two letters to Eugene (Note 63 above), and also Correspondance de Jean-Baptiste Rousseau et de Brossette, ed. Paul Bonnefon, 1910-11, Paris, Cornély, ii, 125, where Rousseau reports the anecdote as he heard it from Eugene; but the work in question is here erroneously named as the 'mémoires des intendants'. Eugene claimed he had paid Lenglet 50 pistoles (c. 500 livres) in advance.

94. Monarchie française, iii, 351; the work was no doubt the Médailles sur les principaux événements du règne de Louis-le-Grand, Paris, Imprimerie royale, 1702.
95. Arch. de la Guerre, A¹ 2413, no.36.
96. Ibid.
97. 'Premier Mémoire', p.6.
98. The letters and dispatches of John Churchill, First Duke of Marlborough, from 1702-12, ed. George Murray, London, Murray, 1845, iv, 680.
99. Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 140, ff. 327-8.
100. See Lenglet's statement to this effect in ibid., f. 337.
101. In a 'Mémoire' submitted to Dubois during his imprisonment in Strasbourg (1722), Lenglet claims that the Jansenists prevented his nomination at this time (ibid., f. 327): this was undoubtedly untrue, and designed to throw dust in the Cardinal's eyes.
102. See Lenglet's account of events in the first of his Mémoires sur la collation des canonicats; see also Xavier Janne d'Othée, Ernest Ruth d'Ans, secrétaire du grand Arnauld, Verviers, Gason, 1949, pp.27 ff.
103. The Comte d'Argenson concluded from his examination of Lenglet's papers that 'la pretention de Langlet a un canonicat de cette Eglise l'attacha aux interests du chapitre'; (Arch. de la Guerre, A¹ 2413, no.36.
104. See 'Premier Mémoire', p.7.
105. Ibid., p.9.
106. Lettre ..., p.2.
107. Nouv.acq.franç.3344, f. 50.
108. Arch. de la Guerre, A¹ 2413, no.36.
109. See above p.66.
110. Cf. below Chapter III, p.106.
111. See letter from the abbé Colbert in Arch. de la Guerre, A¹ 2344, no.265: 'Il est Vray, Monseigneur, qu'il a Eû patente d'aumônier du prince Eugene, mais il est Vray aussy, du moins je le Croy ainsy, qu'il l'a eüe et demandée pour se mettre a Couvert de ce que Les Etats generaux auroient pû faire contre Luy a Cause des Écrits qu'il était pret de faire paroistre pour soutenir les droits de l'Eglise de Tournay'. See also letter to Passionei, Mar. 1714, Vat.Lat. 9815, f. 36.

112. Domenico Passionei (1682-1761) had spent two years in Paris prior to his mission at the Hague; he cultivated close connections with French literary circles, and particularly with aristocratic scholars of the robe class, throughout his life. He was sent as legate to the congresses of Utrecht and Baden, was appointed Nuncio to Switzerland and later to Vienna; finally he became Cardinal in 1739. A close friend of Benedict XIV, he succeeded Quirini as Chief Conservator of the Vatican Library, a function which enhanced his role as bienfaiteur of scholars and men of letters throughout Europe. Lenglet was to maintain a close correspondence with him in later years. (See Biog.univers., xxxi1, 230-2).
113. Lettre à l'Auteur des Observations sur les écrits modernes, pp.5-6.
114. See Bibliography, 10.01.
115. Letter dated 'Anvers, le 2 août 1711', in Utrecht, Archives d'Etat, Fonds Port-Royal 1040. Nonetheless, Lenglet's claim that the Church could not accept nominations to benefices by a Protestant government was in contradiction to the practice in Prussia and Maestricht (cf. J.A.G. Tans, 'Les idées politiques des jansénistes', Neophilologus, 1956, pp.12-13).
116. D'Ans, living in forced exile from France, did, undoubtedly, support the allied side in the war; given his connection with Jaupain, who had been his valet (see Arch. de la Guerre, A¹ 2149, no.134), it is also plausible that he took part in certain intelligence activities. His was clearly a political choice. Lenglet was obviously not in a position to criticise him for taking part in public life on the grounds that he was an ecclesiastic.
117. Pp.778-800.
118. Tournemine (1661-1739) had been called to Paris in 1701 to take up the direction of the Mémoires de Trévoux, which post he held up to 1718. His uncle, Marcel de Coëtlogon, who was bishop of Tournai from 1705-7, entrusted the running of the diocese to him (Biog.univers., xlii, 49-50).
119. 1715, pp.689-93.
120. Lettre à Messieurs les Vicaires Généraux de Monseigneur l'Evêque de Tournay sur le sujet d'un livre qui porte pour titre: Mémoires sur les Collations des Canoncats ..., n.p., 1711.
121. Possibly Louis-Charles Colbert, called 'l'abbé de Maulevrier', son of a former governor of Tournai, François-Edouard, himself brother of 'le grand Colbert' (Dict.de biog.franç., ix, 199).
122. In his Lettre à l'Auteur des Observations..., p.6, Lenglet says he spent six weeks in prison, though in the Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 140, f. 337, he claims it was two months, from the beginning of September to the beginning of November: he was probably exaggerating slightly for the benefit of Cardinal Dubois to whom his 'Mémoire' was addressed.

123. See Lettre à l'Auteur des Observations..., p.6, and Delort Détention des philosophes, ii, 62-3 (interrogation, Oct. 1718).
124. Cf. Janne d'Othée, op.cit., pp.37 ff.
125. See Mahieu, Jansénisme et antijansénisme, p.68.
126. Mémoire presented to Malesherbes, nouv.acq.franç 3344, f.50.
127. Arch. de la Guerre, A¹ 2309, no.183, and A¹ 2311, no.176.
128. Ibid., A¹ 2344, no.265.
129. Ibid., A¹ 2413, no.36.
130. Possibly one of the Desessarts brothers, Alexis (1687-1774) or Jean-Baptiste (1681-1762), both Jansenist clerics and writers (Nouv.biog.gén., xiii, 795).
131. Arch. de la Guerre, A¹ 2411, no.85, and A¹ 2413, no.201.
132. Ibid., A¹ 2413, no.200.
133. Ibid., A¹ 2421, no.113.
134. Vat.Lat.9815, f.36 (Mar. 1714).
135. See Bibliography, 11.01.
136. Published in Les divers caractères des ouvrages historiques, avec le plan d'une nouvelle histoire de la ville de Lyon, Paris, Collombat, 1694.
137. See Bibliography, 11.02.
138. A number of these additions are listed in Le Journal littéraire, Nov.-Dec. 1714, pp.390-9, and in the Leipzig edition of the Méthode (1714) after Mencke's Preface.
139. Mémoires de Trévoux, 1714, p.1665.
140. Cf. Mencke's Preface and Le Journal littéraire, Nov.-Dec. 1714, p.389.
141. Journal littéraire, Nov.-Dec. 1714, pp.389 ff.
142. Ibid., p.390.
143. Les Nouvelles littéraires, i(1715), 127.
144. See Michault, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la vie ..., p.70: 'Le Censeur de cette première édition, fut obligé d'y effacer un grand nombre de sentiments trop hardis, de sarcasmes, et de personnalités injurieuses'. The Journal littéraire, Mar.-Apr. 1714, quotes a number of the remarks which Lenglet had been obliged to remove from the Catalogue des historiens as they had been judged 'trop libres' (p.362). The author remarks that Lenglet would undoubt-

edly have added many more had he been 'en Païs de liberté'. Cf. Appendix re similar remarks which were censored in the 1729 ed. of the Méthode.

144. See the approbation at the back of T.I.
145. Mémoires de Trévoux, 1713, pp.2031-48.
146. Ibid., p.2048. It is clear from this information that Lenglet himself was largely responsible for the writing of the article; it was common practice for authors to submit summaries of their works to the journalists, and Lenglet's was no doubt favourably received by his friend Tournemine who retained the direction of the Mémoires up to 1718.
147. Ibid., p.2047.
148. Ibid., p.2048.
149. Journal des savants, 1713, pp.353-60.
150. Journal littéraire, Mar.-Apr. 1714, pp. 337-63.
151. Ibid., p.363.
152. See Michault, Mémoires, p.70. François Salmon (1677-1736) was a highly erudite cleric who became librarian of the Sorbonne. Lenglet may have known him as a contemporary student (see Biog.univers., xxxvii, 534-5).
153. See Bibliography, 11.03.
154. Mencke (1675-1732) held a chair of history in Leipzig, and had an international reputation for his scholarship; in addition to his post of historiographer to King Augustus of Poland, he was a member of the Royal Societies of London and Berlin (See Biog.univers., xxvii, 614-5).
155. See Bibliography, 11.05 and 11.07. The work is attributed to Zeno in the Nouvelles littéraires, vii (1718), 149, and also in the Bibliotheca menckiana, Leipzig, Gleditsch, 1723, pp.172-3: Mencke, who had many contacts in the scholarly world, is a reliable source. Apostolo Zeno, a native of Venice, was a poet, playwright and scholar; he was closely connected with Ludovico Antonio Muratori, one of the most learned men in Italy, noted for his rationalism and strict critical method, as well as scholars such as Montfaucon and Wolf abroad. In 1710 he had founded, along with Maffei and Vallis-mieri, the Giornale de' letterati with the aim of disseminating sound critical principles; it was severely attacked by the Mémoires de Trévoux (Nouv.biog.gén., xlvi, 969-72; re Muratori and his circle see Gossman, Medievalism and the ideologies of the Enlightenment, pp.73-7).
156. Scipione Maffei (1675-1755), a Veronese nobleman, was likewise a playwright who devoted himself in his later years to erudition and diplomatics. He spent the years 1732-6 in France, where he was closely associated with the scholars of the robe class and was made an

associé surnuméraire of the Académie des Inscriptions. He was also a member of the Royal Societies of London and Berlin. (Biog.univers., xxvi, 19-21).

157. See Preface by Richard Rawlinson in his 1728 translation of the Méthode.
158. See Bibliography, 11.08; Richard Rawlinson (1690-1755), nonjuring bishop, was greatly interested in history and antiquities. He spent the years 1720-6 touring the countries of Western Europe, where he found much material to add to his private collections. He had been elected fellow of the Royal Society in 1714. He published little original material, but many editions (Dictionary of National Biography, xlvii, 331-3).
159. Pp.1665-8. The same note also appeared in the Journal littéraire, Nov.-Dec. 1714, pp.403-5; and in 1715 the Nouvelles littéraires (i, 5-6) assert that Lenglet 'a sous presse une nouvelle Edition de cet Ouvrage'. Yet I have not located any edition by Lenglet prior to that of 1729. See Bibliography 11.04 and 11.10.
160. Arch. de la Guerre, A¹ 2421, no.112 and 113.
161. Ibid., A¹ 2413, no.318.
162. Vat.Lat.9815, f. 36.
163. Arch. de la Guerre, A¹ 2413, no.318.
164. Ibid., A¹ 2396, no.355, letter 9 Dec. 1712.
165. Vat.Lat.9815, f. 36.
166. Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 140, f.72: M. Dubourg reports that the Comte de Sinzendorff had met Lenglet there.
167. Ed. 1744.
168. See Gossman, Medievalism, p.82.
169. Letter to Passionei, Vat.Lat.9815, ff. 36-7.
170. Ibid., f. 37.
171. Cf. Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 140, f. 305.
172. Vat.Lat.9810, ff. 31-2.
173. See Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 141, f. 100. It is difficult to believe Eugene's statement, given that his relations with Lenglet continued long after this date, though it is possible that he had been angered by Lenglet's return to France while still ostensibly his chaplain.
174. Op.cit., p.84.

175. Méthode, ed. Mencke, 'Nouvelle Preface'. (See Bibliography, 11.03).
176. See Minutier, LXVII, 330, Contrat de mariage, 27 Jan. 1719,
and LXVII, 308, Constitution de rentes, 20 Mar. 1715.
Cf. Chapter I, pp.8-9.
177. See below Chapter V, p.283 and Note 2.

CHAPTER III

1715-1728Paris under the Regency

Lenglet's return to Paris coincided with the end of the long reign of the Roi Soleil; in September 1715 Louis XIV died, leaving as his only direct heir a sickly boy of five. Philippe, Duc d'Orléans, first prince of the blood, assumed the full powers of Regent in spite of the wishes of the dead king; the court moved back to Paris, freeing itself of the sombre, moralistic influence of Madame de Maintenon and the Jesuits, and bringing a new life to the capital. Centre of debauchery and haunt of the roués, the Palais-Royal also witnessed a ferment of reforming ideas. In the political arena, the Regent tried to restore some of the powers of the old aristocracy, as a counterbalance to the despotic monarchy and its bureaucracy. Realising that the state's finances were in a disastrous condition, he listened with interest to the exciting and innovatory monetary theories of one of his gambling associates, the Scot, John Law. From 1716-1720 Law, who had established a bank issuing paper money, backed by a trading company with share capital, went from strength to strength: the bank became a royal bank, Law took over the national debt, and was appointed Contrôleur-général des Finances. But the 'Système' became grossly over-inflated in its success; while the returns from his trading company fell far below Law's expectations, great speculators and his enemies, the financiers, eroded the investors' confidence. As the value of the shares plummeted, chaos reigned in Paris where some great fortunes were made, and

thousands of others were irreparably destroyed. With this resounding failure much of the Regent's reforming zeal was dissipated.

One of the top men of the new Régime, close to the Regent and to his extutor the abbé Dubois, was Claude Le Blanc¹; former Intendant in Flanders, where, as we saw, Lenglet collaborated with him, he was appointed to the Regent's Conseil de Guerre in 1715. On his return to Paris the abbé continued to exploit this connection. The success of his relationship with Le Blanc, which endured despite the discredit Lenglet had suffered in the eyes of other administrators, may in part have been due to family connections, for in 1714 Lenglet gives his address in Paris as 'chez Mr de la Barre rue des fontaines au Marais'.² This is the family into which Lenglet's sister Marguerite was to marry in 1719; her husband Urbain de la Barre, a 'lieutenant de la connétablie' at the time of his marriage, was one of Le Blanc's henchmen, and was to become deeply involved in the 'Le Blanc affair' in 1724.³ Were the de la Barre among the relatives whom, we have surmised, Lenglet's mother had in Paris? This seems very likely in view of the fact that Marguerite also resided with them long before her marriage to Urbain.⁴ Whether they recommended Lenglet to Le Blanc, or vice versa, is uncertain; but by 1718 at the latest both Nicolas and his future brother-in-law were attached to the Minister's service.⁵

Le Blanc was to become notorious for the number of ambiguous characters he employed as spies, or under a more respectable guise, as 'researchers'. According to Lenglet's own description 'il était employé à des recherches d'histoire et de politique pour M. le Blanc, et à perfectionner la Bibliothèque de ce Ministre';⁶ that all the

services he rendered Le Blanc were not quite as anodine as he would here suggest will be seen below. Nonetheless, it is true that the formation and care of Le Blanc's library was one of Lenglet's major activities throughout the succeeding years.⁷ This no doubt gave him access to a milieu which was as interesting from a literary as from a political point of view. Le Blanc, like so many of his social peers in this period, was a cultivated man and a bibliophile; it would appear that many literary figures were guests at his house. Marais, writing in 1722, recounts a quarrel between Voltaire and an officer which took place at Le Blanc's table.⁸ It is more than likely that Lenglet met the young writer on such an occasion; there was a certain amount of contact between them in later years, and Voltaire intervened on the abbé's behalf during two of his many imprisonments.⁹ Lenglet's admiration for Voltaire was unreserved, and it was he who first collected and published the variants of the Henriade.¹⁰ Voltaire in turn knew and appreciated Lenglet's work in the field of history.¹¹

It was possibly here too that Lenglet met certain minor writers, such as Piganiol de la Force¹² whose manuscript Description de la France he could praise before its publication,¹³ or the abbé Nadal, poet and member of the Académie des Inscriptions.¹⁴ Both men were witnesses at the Lenglet/de la Barre wedding in 1719.¹⁵ There is some evidence to suggest that Marguerite's home in turn attracted some of the 'esprits forts' abounding in Paris. We inadvertently get a glimpse of one de la Barre soirée of music and dance from a deposition in the Le Blanc affair in 1725,¹⁶ and it is possibly to their family residence in the Marais that Anne Bellinzani, 'une des femmes les plus spirituelles et les plus distinguées du siècle',¹⁷ refers in a letter of 1719; angered by Lenglet and his sister who, she declares, have

betrayed her, she remarks:

J'ai regardé comme une perte de ne plus aller dans un lieu où je trouvois des conversations que l'on ne trouve point ailleurs.¹⁸

It was likewise in 1715 that Lenglet met another notable personage, the young Comte de Hoym, son of the king of Poland's finance minister and later himself ambassador to France;¹⁹ Hoym was yet another bibliophile, whose library Lenglet later praised as 'un des prodiges de la littérature',²⁰ and they in fact met when they were both looking for books in the same librairie.²¹ The young Pole was obviously impressed by Lenglet's erudition, and invited him frequently to his house;²² the other habitués included such notable figures as the Cardinal de Rohan and Madame de Tencin, and there were many foreign visitors.²³ Even after Hoym's departure from France in 1718 he wrote several letters to the abbé 'qui concernoient des livres dont le dit sieur comte de Hoym vouloit estre instruit'.²⁴ It was likewise Hoym who put Lenglet in contact with the Présidente Ferrand.²⁵

There were in Paris other circles of a purely scholarly nature which welcomed Lenglet; the erudite Daniel Huet, ex-bishop of Avranches and member of the Académie Française,²⁶ had his own mini-academy which met in the Jesuit convent to which he had retired. Lenglet stated in a police interrogation in 1718 that 'il ne conoist du corps du Parlement que le président Couchet, qu'il a rencontré quelquefois chez M. l'ancien évêque d'Avranches aux Jésuites, où se rassemblent différentes personnes de lettres'.²⁷ Huet was the author of many works of erudition, not all of them totally orthodox; Lenglet remarks on his Quaestiones Alnetanae, which was not well received by the public, that 'Antoine Arnauld après avoir vu ce livre demanda de quelle Religion étoit M. Huet qui veut trouver les dogmes de la Religion Chrétienne dans tous

les livres des Payens'.²⁸ Huet's interests were wide: he wrote an anonymous novel, and a Lettre sur l'origine des romans.

Another such group, which appears to have started up around 1722, was that which met every Thursday at the Hôtel de Rohan under the patronage of the Cardinal and presided over by his learned Italian librarian, the abbé Oliva.²⁹ Given the patronage with which the Cardinal honoured Lenglet it is highly likely that he would have been invited to join this circle; moreover, in the preface to his Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc Lenglet eulogises Oliva 'qui me fait la grâce d'être de mes amis, et qui est très versé dans toutes les parties de la littérature'.³⁰ If Lenglet was indeed a member of this circle, it establishes an interesting link with the scholars of the Académie des Inscriptions, and particularly the group which revolved around Henri de Boulainvilliers.³¹ Boulainvilliers' protégé, Nicolas Fréret, who was yet another of the Oratorian Rollin's brilliant pupils, and who had been elected to the Académie des Inscriptions at the age of twenty-six, frequented the meetings at the Hôtel de Rohan.³² Montesquieu likewise joined the group for a time, but he was put off by the Jesuit Tournemine, who we have seen was a friend of Lenglet's, and who apparently dominated the society. Tournemine 'was lacking in common sense and tact, though not in learning',³³ and his conduct in the circle gave rise to a lampoon which began with the following verses:

Dieux, quelle est cette Académie
Où Fréret passe pour sçavant
Et dont, pour comble d'infamie,
Tournemine est le président?

Dans cette halle du Parmesse
Ne cherchez point de beaux esprits;
Ce sont bavards de toute espèce,
Tournemine les a choisis.³⁴

This attack is, obviously, very biased; Fréret's scholarship was generally highly respected, and he was far from being the conventional pedant: in 1714 he had been imprisoned in the Bastille for reading an unorthodox paper on the origins of the monarchy at the Académie des Inscriptions.³⁵ Lenglet would no doubt have profited greatly from the exchange of ideas with a man so closely associated with all that was avant-garde in contemporary critical scholarship. This may well be where he was introduced to Boulainvilliers' works, which circulated largely in manuscript form, and some of which he was himself to publish by means of subterfuge in 1729 and 1731.

In addition to these activities Lenglet continued to supply Prince Eugene with books; indeed in May 1722 Cardinal Dubois was under the impression that this had been Lenglet's 'principale occupation' for the past five or six years.³⁶ There are some letters from Eugene to Lenglet in the Staatsarchiv in Vienna; for example in one dated 4th October 1719 the Prince thanks him for 'la liste des quelques livres les plus rares que vous m'avez envoyés et de l'offre obligeante que vous me faites de vos services'.³⁷ In October 1717 Lenglet wrote to Eugene proposing to dedicate a new edition of the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire to him, an offer which Eugene graciously accepted:

Vous êtes trop favorablement prévenu à mon égard et j'estime trop vos sciences pour ne pas accepter la dédication de la Méthode pour étudier l'histoire que vous voulez faire paroître considérablement augmentée et changée. Je souhaite en échange quelque occasion favorable de vous témoigner ma juste reconnaissance.³⁸

Encouraging words which Lenglet was to recall in 1721, and which he no doubt took as an invitation to visit the Prince in Vienna. As to the projected edition, I have found no trace of it, nor of any dedication to Eugene: Lenglet's other occupations undoubtedly delayed the execution of his project for some time, and presumably the cooling of

their relations subsequently led him to abandon it.

In these years following his return to Paris, Lenglet also kept up his interest in church affairs. As a theologian and historian he was frequently consulted by the hierarchy on points of controversy. He gives an account of one such occasion in a 'Mémoire' addressed to Cardinal Dubois in 1722. It will be remembered that he had already worked for René François de Beauveau when the latter was bishop of Tournai:

La dernière assemblée du Clergé de 1715 ayant résolu de proscrire les deux livres si pernicieux du Temoignage de la Vérité³⁹ et des Exaples,⁴⁰ je fus consulté par M. de Beauveau lors archevêque de Toulouse, qui me pria de lui donner mon avis doctrinal sur ces deux ouvrages dont il devait faire son rapport à l'assemblée. Je remis à ce Prélat un Mémoire où je prouve que les Jansénistes avaient dans leur Témoinage de la Vérité adopté des Principes des Calvinistes sur l'autorité de l'Eglise; Et je me sers principalement contre eux du Livre des préjugés légitimes contre les calvinistes par M. Nicole l'un des plus célèbres Jansénistes et autrefois l'âme de leur parti. Et par un second Mémoire je prouve que l'auteur du livre des Exaples était un faussaire qui tronquait et falsifiait les témoignages des Pères de l'Eglise pour les rapprocher de ses opinions.⁴¹

Such 'Mémoires' were rarely printed, and so are mainly lost to us. In this case Lenglet was no doubt pleased to have an additional chance of avenging the supposed wrongs done to him by the Jansenist group in the Netherlands; but this and other such exercises do account for the reputation he gained in certain circles of a scribbler who sold his pen to the highest bidder. He was doubtless still hoping that de Beauveau would procure a benefice for him.

His first publication on his return to France was an edition of the Commentaire de M. Dupuy sur le traité des libertés de l'Eglise

Gallicane de M. Pierre Pithou.⁴² The subject of the rights of the

gallican church was very topical in 1714 following upon the publication

of the Papal Bull Unigenitus, and the efforts of Louis XIV to ensure that it be accepted by all the French clergy. The majority of the bishops who assembled to decide on the question affirmed their right to examine the papal condemnation of Quesnel, and accept or reject it as they saw fit, an affirmation which was not at all to the liking of Pope Clement XI; the more extreme opponents of the Bull among the clergy and in the Parlement declared that it was a manifest proof of the Pope's fallibility. Thus it was felt that it was up to the French hierarchy to point out his errors and reject his Bull. In such an atmosphere there was obviously a good deal of interest in a new edition of Dupuy's work, which had formerly been banned in France. Lenglet added notes, a bibliography, and an eighty-page preface which demonstrated, he claimed, 'la juste et sage modération qu'on doit avoir pour l'autorité du Saint Siège'.⁴³ It is true that he takes to task the Jansenists for the extremism of their attacks on papal authority, particularly on the question of fallibility; his own defense of the libertés concentrates on the rights of the King vis-à-vis the Pope rather than on those of the bishops and clergy. This preface, which consisted of an historical exposé of the libertés, and a bibliographical commentary in what was now typical Lenglet style, was suppressed by order of Daguesseau, Procureur général of the Parlement of Paris, himself a firm opponent of the Bull and of the theory of papal infallibility. In a manuscript note on one copy of the Commentaire Lenglet affirms that the suppression was due to the fact 'que j'ai voulu traiter la matiere des Libertés de l'Eglise gallicane independamment de l'infaillibilité du Pape'.⁴⁴ Copies of the preface were apparently much sought-after: Michault quotes one critic who regarded it as a 'très belle pièce'.⁴⁵ It would appear that with the

help of his friend Tournemine, and a certain M. de Rochepot, Lenglet was given some kind of permission tacite by the royal authorities, who would not be eager to back up Daguesseau, and the preface is in fact bound into all the copies I have seen.

Lenglet could not however claim to have guarded the same moderation in his notes, which contain a large number of lively anti-papal sallies; many of these were suppressed by the royal censor, as were a certain number of comments on the rights of the Parlement in the matter which seemingly also offended Daguesseau. At the back of the annotated copy in the Bibliothèque Nationale there are bound two sets of cartons, one containing those corrections ordered by the Chancellor, the other containing those made by order of Daguesseau. Many copies of the uncensored pages were in fact sold to the public, often with the cartons alongside, a practice which was developed to a high degree of sophistication in the distribution of Lenglet's Méthode pour étudier l'histoire in 1729.⁴⁷ As for the text of the Commentaire it was, as Michault remarks, 'fort correct'.⁴⁸

This edition was ready for publication around April 1715,⁴⁹ and Lenglet dedicated it to the Chancellor Voysin: this was perhaps part of the price paid in overcoming the censorship problems. The publication provoked relatively little response in the press, with the exception of one review in the Journal des savants⁵⁰ which was highly ironic: the reviewer obviously did not share Lenglet's professed support for the rights of the Crown as against those of the gallican church proper. He is also attacked on account of his unrestrained comments on other writers:

La Liberté avec laquelle l'Auteur du Catalogue s'exprime sur les Auteurs vivants, nous fait connoître qu'il fait un grand fonds sur la moderation de ses confreres, ou qu'il se soucie peu de ce qu'ils pourront dire contre ses décisions. 51

Another opportunity to exert his pen on matters of church discipline arose in 1718 in connection with the affair of the Papal Bulls.

Clement XI, irritated by the Regent's failure to impose the Bull Unigenitus on the recalcitrant pro-Jansenist prelates, refused in reprisal to grant his Bulls of Investiture to those whom d'Orléans had nominated to bishoprics in France. In May the Council of Regency set up a commission, of which the Duc de Saint-Simon was a member, to consider, among other things, possible ways of forcing the Pope into granting the Bulls.⁵² Many canonists and theologians were consulted on the matter; Saint-Simon asked a number of known appelants for their opinions, and many other scholars gratuitously offered papers on the subject. Whether Lenglet belonged to this latter category, or whether he was solicited by other interested parties, is uncertain; but a manuscript 'Mémoire sur le rétablissement de la Discipline Ecclesiastique troublée par les contestations presentes de l'Eglise' in his hand is preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale.⁵³

In this 'Mémoire' Lenglet explicitly defends the position of Cardinal de Noailles against the Pope,⁵⁴ completely rejecting, in common with the appelants, the notion of papal infallibility. He uses his historical scholarship and knowledge of canon law to show that before the introduction of the royal Concordats, the gallican church had favoured the election of bishops by the second order of clergy. He suggests that the king should therefore renounce the Concordat on this occasion and allow the Chapters concerned to proceed with elections. Lenglet's suggestion is in line with the school of 'Richerist' thought which was evolving among certain Jansenist and gallican elements in the church, and which postulated the devolution

of democratic rights within the church from the hierarchy to the lower orders of clergy and to the laity. Unfortunately, here, as elsewhere, it is impossible to evaluate the sincerity of Lenglet's argument; but the 'Mémoire' is an interesting example of the kind of propaganda document he was often called upon to write for his ecclesiastical superiors, and most of which, being anonymous, have been lost to us.

Lenglet was active in other fields too; the year 1716 saw the publication of his Méthode pour étudier la géographie, with a dedication to the Duc de Chartres praising the new Regent.⁵⁵ This was published anonymously, but Lenglet clearly intended that it should be received by the public as one of his own original productions: his initials were printed in the privilège, and the title itself suggested a relation to the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire. In fact, the body of the work was taken from a Nouvelle géographie ou description exacte de l'Univers tirée des meilleurs auteurs tant anciens que modernes, published by Martineau du Plessis, a refugee Huguenot, in Amsterdam in 1700. The first edition had not been very popular at the outset, partly because the writer was unknown, partly because it was badly printed.⁵⁶ Nonetheless, by 1715 the work had become 'assez rare et fort chère'⁵⁷ in Paris, and there was a demand on the part of the booksellers for a new edition. In a letter to a Dutch newspaper Lenglet explained how he went about fulfilling that demand:

On ne voulait pas que cela se fit, comme le pratiquent la plupart de vos libraires, qui ne savent donner à un livre déjà usé, un air de nouveauté, qui le fait lire une seconde fois avec plaisir. On en changea le titre; on corrigea dans le corps de l'ouvrage beaucoup de choses qui étoient peu exactes ou entièrement inutiles. Enfin, on a crû en faisant tous ces changemens, devoir mettre la Géographie de M. Martineau en état d'être revêtuë du Privilège de Sa Majesté.⁵⁸

In addition, to justify the title of 'Méthode', Lenglet composed a

preliminary 'Discours sur l'Etude de la géographie'; the other major augmentations were a catalogue of useful works, which counted for a large part of the third volume, and a fourth volume containing an abridgement of ancient geography.

The changes to Martineau's text were in fact, despite Lenglet's protestations, very minor. Some concerned the new boundaries drawn by recent peace treaties, but most of them were politically motivated: Lenglet was anxious to dissociate himself from the exile's Protestantism, and took care to insert terms such as 'hérétiques' in the appropriate places. Here again he showed proof of his attachement to the Jacobite cause by persistently referring to King William as 'l'Usurpateur Guillaume III. Prince d'Orange',⁵⁹ a title which he had likewise given him in the Brussels edition of the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire. It is surprising that the censor of this later work let such remarks pass, since England and France were now at peace, and the Regent was negotiating a new agreement which was to lead to the expulsion of the Stuart pretender from France in 1717. Lenglet included many remarks which were offensive to individual writers, especially in his 'Catalogue'. They were addressed mainly to the authors of previous treatises in the same area; for these Michault took Lenglet severely to task:

Il a trop peu ménagé les Auteurs dont il a lui-même transcrit en partie les Ouvrages.⁶⁰

Again other censors, such as Gros de Boze with regard to the 1729 edition of the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire, were much more strict in excising Lenglet's libellous attacks on his fellow writers.

A lengthy and approbatory review appeared in the Mémoires de Trévoux in March 1717;⁶¹ Lenglet was named as the person 'à qui on doit la

perfection de cet ouvrage', and no mention was made of Martineau du Plessis. The authors of the Mémoires were therefore taken to task along with Lenglet himself in a letter inserted in the Nouvelles littéraires of November 1717,⁶² which accused them of being willing parties to the latter's plagiarism. It was undoubtedly embarrassing for Lenglet to have it pointed out that he had dedicated a second-hand work to the Duc de Chartres.⁶³ In addition he was strongly criticised for the kind of changes he had made to the original text. Lenglet defended himself in a reply published in the same paper in January 1718;⁶⁴ he claimed he had never willingly hidden the origins of the work, and had deliberately refrained from putting his own name to it even though his additions amounted to half of the new edition. He also stated that half the copies issued did in fact bear the name of Martineau du Plessis;⁶⁵ in this way he had felt he could satisfy at once multiple demands in his market:

Par-là celui qui demande une Méthode pour étudier la Géographie, en a ici une accompagnée de tous les secours, qui servent à cette science; et celui qui veut la Géographie de M. Martineau, la trouve ici fort augmentée. ⁶⁶

A further letter in May 1719⁶⁷ refutes Lenglet's defence that he had never tried to pass the work off as his own, and underlines his failure either in the 'Discours', or in the 'Catalogue' where he specifically mentioned Du Plessis's work, to inform the public that it was this selfsame Géographie he was publishing. Lenglet obviously decided to be more careful in subsequent editions, where he made an express attribution to Du Plessis in a new Preface. Although frequently criticised for inaccuracies and omissions,⁶⁸ the work was evidently a commercial success, and was re-edited with augmentations many times up to 1768.

Notwithstanding these literary activities which must have occupied much of his time, Lenglet became increasingly involved in the political events of the day. The year 1718 was a troubled one for the Regent and his government. The disputes on the subject of Unigenitus were far from ended, and the Parlement of Paris was becoming steadily more bold in its opposition to the Bull. The latter body had other grounds for feeling antagonistic towards the man it had helped carry to power: he had removed the area of finance from their jurisdiction to that of the Cour des Monnaies, in order to forestall any further opposition on their part to his planned monetary reforms. Philippe's treatment of Daguesseau, the much-esteemed Procureur-général, who had been forced to resign the office of Chancellor only a few months after his appointment, likewise aroused a storm of protest from the Parlement. There was discontent on other fronts too: the Duc du Maine, legitimised son of Louis XIV, and particularly the Duchesse his wife, aggrieved at having been thwarted of any effective power in the Regency, provided a focus for other dissatisfied elements in the nobility; their clamourings for the convening of the States General were a continual thorn in the Regent's side. The latter, at the instigation of Dubois and the Comte d'Argenson, determined to put an end to the opposition of these two camps in one fell swoop; a lit de justice was prepared in great secrecy for the 26th August, to which the Parlement was convoked at the last moment. The new Chancellor, d'Argenson, informed the Parlement of the King's displeasure at their opposition to his will, and forced them to register an edict which severely limited their powers and their right of 'remonstrance'. There followed an edict reducing the rank of the legitimised princes from that of Princes of the Blood given to them by Louis XIV to that of new Dukes and Peers, thus placing the Duc du

Maine in a position beneath that of the long-established great families. He was accordingly deprived of his position as 'surintendant de l'éducation du Roi', which title was given to the Duc de Bourbon. Again the Parlement was forced to register this edict, but the next day the members protested loudly and publicly that they had been obliged to act against their will and better judgement. The Regent again reacted swiftly, and three of the ring-leaders of the opposition, the Présidents de Blamont and Feydeau, and the Conseiller Saint-Martin, were arrested; the whole Parlement was threatened with exile to Pontoise, whereupon the opposition was largely stifled.⁶⁹

Predictably, Lenglet became caught up in this ferment of dissatisfaction. During the summer of 1718 the Comte de Hoym wrote to him, and asked him to pass on a letter to another of his friends in Paris, the Présidente Ferrand, to whom he warmly recommended the abbé.⁷⁰ This extraordinary personage, though now sixty years of age, was evidently closely associated with certain members of the Parlement, and following on the arrest of their three colleagues they were plotting ways of undermining the Regent's authority. She was in contact with the abbé René Pucelle,⁷¹ who was her close contemporary in age, and who was the undoubted leader of the opponents of Unigenitus in the Parlement. Both this Parlementarian group, and the Maine côterie, seem to have reached a common political conclusion in this summer of 1718: that they should try to attack the Regent through his cousin the Duc de Bourbon. The Duchesse du Maine unsuccessfully tried to provoke a quarrel between them; her plans were thwarted by one of Le Blanc's spies.⁷² The second plan, that conceived by the Présidente Ferrand, was of a more serious nature. She hoped to persuade the Duc de Bourbon

to demand the 'Commandement de la Maison du Roi', which would give him control of the royal troops and place him in a position of strength vis-à-vis the Regent; he would then be ready to take over the Regency should Philippe die from the illness he was suspected to have. It was presumably hoped that he would then look favourably on the Parlement which had helped him to that position; memories were short, for this was precisely the hope which had been cherished with regard to Philippe only two years earlier when the Parlement supported his rejection of Louis XIV's will.

Lenglet seems to have rushed into collaborating with the Présidente without much reflection. He states that on the second visit he paid to her house, after the introduction through Hoym, she spoke to him about 'la mauvaise administration du gouvernement', and read to him a 'Mémoire' which she had composed on the subject; its aim was to spur Bourbon to action, promising the Parlement's support. A week later she asked Lenglet if he knew anyone in Monsieur le Duc's household who could present the 'Mémoire' to him, remarking that she did not wish it to be written in her own hand. Lenglet replied that he could get access to Bourbon through a certain Aymond, 'officier de la chambre du Roy', and offered to copy the 'Mémoire' out himself. This he did, correcting certain terms which he felt were rather too strong, though what was left was far from anodine: it attacked the government, particularly Dubois and d'Argenson, in thinly veiled terms, and was far from flattering to the Duc de Bourbon himself.⁷³ A second 'Mémoire', which Lenglet subsequently wrote out from the oral instructions of the Présidente, clearly suggested that the Duc d'Orléans was looking for an opportunity to attack his cousin Bourbon, who should therefore

forestall such an event by his own action.⁷⁴

The Sieur Aymond and his contacts proved to be less foolhardy than Lenglet, and refused to have anything to do with the affair; the abbé finally had to resort to sending the Duc a letter, which he signed in full,⁷⁵ and he was accorded an interview on the 19th September. He read the 'Mémoires' to Bourbon, who expressed displeasure at the Parlement's attitude, and protested his own fidelity to the Regent. He added that 'si ces Mémoires ne lui étoient pas présentés par un ecclésiastique, qu'il croiroit que ce seroit un piège que ses ennemis lui auroient voulu tendre'.⁷⁶ After Lenglet's departure, he wrote his own comments in the margin of the second 'Mémoire', and promptly sent all the documents to the Duc d'Orléans.⁷⁷

Just how much support the Présidente had in the Parlement is unclear; she did tell Lenglet that he could name Pucelle to the Duc, and that if the latter showed interest in her proposition, she would give him the name of the 'chefs de meutte de chaque chambre'.⁷⁸ But in any case the affair was important enough to call for some reaction on the part of the authorities. What is to some degree surprising is that Lenglet should have become involved in a conspiracy which ran directly counter to the occupations of his patron Le Blanc at that time; the latter, along with d'Argenson, was Dubois' instrument in uncovering the numerous plots against the Regent's authority. One can only assume that it was an irrepressible taste for intrigue, coupled with a certain degree of identification with the cause of the Parlement which is evident at various points in his career, that led him into this imprudent action which might have cost him the Minister's goodwill.⁷⁹ It was in fact Le Blanc himself who called Lenglet and the Présidente for

questioning on the 27th September.⁸⁰ Apparently she was first taken to de la Barre's house, where she was interviewed by the Minister; then she and Lenglet were interrogated, both separately and together, by Monsieur de Machault, Lieutenant général de Police. The Présidente denied all knowledge of Lenglet's actions; her involvement in the affair is however beyond a doubt, judging not only on the evidence of Lenglet's detailed statements, but from certain remarks she made in letters to Hoym which she wrote in the following August. For example on one occasion she stated:

Je dois vous apprendre que je ne vois plus Lab. Fr., et qu'il m'a manqué dans l'affaire qui m'est arrivée d'une manière qui a blessé également l'estime et l'amitié;⁸¹

it is also clear from this remark that she knew Lenglet better than she admitted in the interrogation. On another occasion she tells Hoym to forget about the wrong he feels he has done Lenglet;⁸² was it therefore he who had originally involved Lenglet in the 'plot'? It does appear that Lenglet's sister tried to use Hoym's letters to Lenglet to vindicate her brother;⁸³ they must have contained at least some compromising elements.

However, as all the documents were in Lenglet's hand, it was he who was made the scapegoat, a role which the Présidente had obviously expected him to accept without a murmur; such were the risks run by men of no social standing who chose to dabble in subversive politics. Since the Regent was informed of the affair, someone had to be punished; not even Le Blanc could save Lenglet from his fate. On the 29th September he was escorted to the Bastille by his future brother-in-law, who was a 'lieutenant de la connétablie', and was 'écroué' in due form.⁸⁴

By a fortuitous combination of circumstances, Lenglet was able to turn his prison term to his own profit. At the time of his arrest, the du Maine group were in contact with the court of Spain, where the ambitious prime-minister, Cardinal Albéroni, was eager to seize any opportunity of extending Spanish influence into France. The plan drawn up, through the intermediary of the ineffectual Spanish ambassador in Paris, the prince de Cellamare, was to capture the Regent and imprison him in the castle of Toledo, whereupon Philip V of Spain would take over as Regent of France during the minority of his cousin Louis. The Duc du Maine was, of course, promised a return to his former status under the new Régime. In August a scribe from the Bibliothèque du Roy named Buvat, who had been asked to copy some documents for Cellamare, informed the abbé Dubois, now Ministre des Affaires Etrangères, of what was going on. Dubois decided to let them intrigue as they wished, winding a longer noose around their own necks; it was only in December that he swooped and confiscated documents clearly incriminating Cellamare. A large number of the Spaniard's associates were taken to the Bastille.⁸⁵ One of the ring-leaders was a certain abbé Brigaut, who was arrested as he tried to flee to Spain. Apparently he was well-informed as to the nature of the conspiracy, and the names of those involved, but was unwilling to make a confession; Le Blanc asked Lenglet to play 'mouton', and draw information from his fellow-prisoner. He was no doubt promised his own pardon in return; Lenglet claims that he only accepted the job on condition that those whose names he uncovered would not be condemned to death:⁸⁶ he perhaps had some tardy qualms about exploiting his cloth to such ends. This condition was in fact fulfilled, though Lenglet was undoubtedly naive in believing it was out of deference to him: Dubois had other infinitely more politic reasons for treating the conspirators gently.⁸⁷

Lenglet apparently shared a room with Brigaut;⁸⁸ he no doubt found it easy to gain the unfortunate prisoner's confidence, as he could tell him that he himself had been involved in a similar plot. In the 'Réflexions sur la conspiration' he describes the psychological tactics he used:

Ce sont mes peruations qui ont engagé les principaux acteurs de cette scene à s'ouvrir entierement à Son Altesse Royal: et je leur persuadai que sans demander grace il la leur accorderoit volontiers de lui même. Mais qu'on ne lui devoit rien cacher, et que la verité le desarmeroit. Je me donnai pour exemple.⁸⁹

Le Blanc used to visit him and receive his report every Friday; it was not however until November 1719 that Brigaut made a full confession: Lenglet read the letter himself before it was sent to the Duc d'Orléans.⁹⁰ That Lenglet's reports were useful to Dubois and Le Blanc is certain, for not only was he released in December 1719,⁹¹ but he was given a royal pension of 1000 livres per annum 'sans même qu'il l'eut demandée', which he enjoyed for the rest of his life, although like all other pensions it was reduced by one fifth in 1726.⁹² He was promised greater rewards to come, but these did not materialise, unless one supposes that Le Blanc had some hand in the marriage of Lenglet's sister to Urbain de la Barre in January 1719, but there is no proof to this effect.

It appears that soon after his release our abbé once again found employment in the area of foreign affairs: some years later, during his stay in Vienna, he told the Count d'Oropeza, Chancellor of the Council of Flanders, 'que c'est lui qui a dressé tous les memoires qui se sont faits pour la negotiation et les conventions du mariage du Roy et de l'Infante'.⁹³ The Regent had been forced to declare war on Spain in January 1719, in support of his new ally England, but by the end of the year hostilities had more-or-less ceased, and France and Spain

began negotiating a secret treaty which culminated in the betrothal of Louix XV and Philip V's three-year-old daughter on the one hand, and the marriage of the Spanish King's eldest son to the Regent's daughter.⁹⁴ It is probable that Lenglet was employed, thanks to Le Blanc's protection, to do historical research for the French negotiators; but it is also conceivable that it was the Spanish diplomats who engaged his services, as they were later to do at the Congress of Soissons: this is in fact the construction put on his remark by the Count d'Oropeza.⁹⁵ Lenglet must have had at least a reading knowledge of Spanish, as he likewise had of Italian.⁹⁶

Lenglet's literary activity took very much a secondary place during this period. He was planning to publish a new edition of the works of Pierre Abélard, which was mentioned by Moréri in 1718,⁹⁷ but this, like many similar projects, never seems to have been brought to fruition. Lenglet nonetheless still had it in mind in 1722, for he visited the Emperor's librarian in Vienna in that year to enquire about manuscripts of Abélard's works which might be conserved in the Imperial collections.⁹⁸ It was nonetheless around 1720, though some bibliographers put the date as early as 1700, that he published the first of many editions of the French poets of earlier centuries, Le Cabinet satyrique.⁹⁹ This interest of Lenglet's, both in the national literary tradition, and in 'libertine' works, was to come to its full fruition in the 1730 s,¹⁰⁰ but was already strong at the earlier period: during his visit to Vienna in 1721 he was working on Villon, Pathelin and Coquillart.¹⁰¹ The Cabinet, which was first published in 1618, was a collection of the best licentious poetry of the day; Lenglet tried to include in his edition the different pieces from all the previous editions. He attempted to modernise the vocabulary and even the syntax

of the poems, with rather unfortunate results;¹⁰² he also added about seven pieces in verse, mainly signed P.L.D., as well as a prologue and an epilogue, which we must assume to be of his own composition. They are written with the most extraordinary bad taste, both as regards style and content, and can be classed with an atrocious little poem addressed to the abbé Desqueux which he had included in the pamphlet of 1707.¹⁰³ Mercifully, after this attempt Lenglet seems to have abandoned his poetic aspirations. The edition was probably published in Holland;¹⁰⁴ Jean Gay remarks that the authorities in France rarely bothered to suppress this work, unlike many others of a similarly 'gaillarde' nature, and attributes this to the fact that it contained singularly few references which are specifically anti-religious.¹⁰⁵

Lenglet was simultaneously occupied by yet another irregular activity. In 1718 the learned abbé Jean-Paul Bignon, who had been responsible for the revival of the Académie des Inscriptions, turning it into the focal point for the intellectual activity of the nobility of robe and sword, was appointed royal librarian;¹⁰⁵ he thereupon put his rich personal library up for sale the better to devote himself to his new post.¹⁰⁷ The collection was bought by Law, and was apparently kept locked up for some time; after the Scotsman's flight to England in December 1720 it was acquired by the wily abbé Dubois, no doubt on very favourable terms. Around this time, whether before or after the first sale is not very clear, the Journal littéraire tells us that 'une personne assez connue dans la République des lettres par sa connaissance des Livres, avoit trouvé moyen de s'introduire dans cette Bibliothèque pour en avoir soin'.¹⁰⁸ The index clearly indicates that the 'personne' in question is none other than Lenglet. The journalist goes on to state

that some time afterwards a large number of the best books were found to be missing, so that the library for which Law had paid 125,000 livres, and to which another collection worth 40,000 livres had been added, was now valued as low as 25,000 livres in all. The obvious implication is that Lenglet stole, or at least was somehow involved in the theft of 140,000 livres worth of books. The figures quoted may be greatly exaggerated, but that the basic accusation is justified can be proven from the exchange of letters between Lenglet and Cardinal Dubois during the former's imprisonment in Strasbourg.¹⁰⁹ It would be interesting to establish whether Lenglet was in fact employed by Bignon before the sale of the library; the only definite indication of a link between them at this time is the fact that after Lenglet's arrest in 1722 Bignon tries indirectly to recover a 'cassette', of the contents of which we are unfortunately not informed, which was in Lenglet's possession. Comte Dubourg, who was holding Lenglet in Strasbourg, replied that he could not return it to him without the express authorisation of Dubois, as it had figured in the Inventory of Lenglet's belongings.¹¹⁰ This does prove that there was some degree of acquaintance between Lenglet and Bignon; one may wonder therefore if the latter had any knowledge of, or was party to, Lenglet's misdeed. It is noteworthy that in 1735 Bignon's name was associated with an affair of 'détournement d'estampes', and rumour had it that he was about to lose his place of Royal Librarian on that account.¹¹¹ He may have felt little compunction about cheating upstarts like Law and Dubois for his own ends. In any case, Bignon does not appear to have held our abbé's transgression against him, for Lenglet repeatedly addresses thanks to him in his prefaces for giving him access to the rare collections of books and manuscripts in the Royal Library on which he based his

editions,¹¹² and without which he could not have brought his projects to fruition. Again we must wonder what kind of financial reward Lenglet gained from his crime, the sums involved being so great; yet we will find him apparently suffering from extreme poverty in 1721. We must assume either that he took these great risks for an insignificant financial return, and therefore presumably was motivated by different concerns, or that he devoted his gains to something other than his personal livelihood.

Vienna: a lost Maecenas

A fear of discovery or arrest may, however, be one of several reasons why Lenglet decided to leave France in September 1721. The ostensible reason, which he offered in later interrogations, was to ask Prince Eugene, governor of the Netherlands, for a canonicate in Tournai.¹¹³ He stated that he had friends in the Chapter since his involvement there in 1710, who had continually pressed him to ask for a benefice;¹¹⁴ as I have already emphasised, this was one of the few ways in which he could aspire to a regular income. He had seriously contemplated this step in 1720, but had been dissuaded by his sister, Madame de la Barre, 'qui ne put s'empêcher de verser des larmes, pour l'en détourner':¹¹⁵ it will be remembered that their brother Jacques had gone into exile in Brussels at around this time. But in the summer of 1721 he found himself in particularly straitened circumstances, having failed to secure even one of the canonicates at Soissons, which were worth a mere seven or eight hundred livres.¹¹⁶ He was at this

time living with the de la Barre , who spent the whole of the summer months in their country residence outside Paris; they invited Lenglet to retire there with them, but he wished to remain in Paris where he was employed in doing historical and political research for Le Blanc, and in building up the latter's library. He therefore stayed behind in their city residence, 'mais on le laissoit seulement avec du pain, son beaufrère n'étant pas obligé d'entretenir un second ménage pour lui',¹¹⁷ which state of affairs pushed him to take a decision. Though it is clear from the papers found in his trunks that he had some intentions with regard to the canonicate in Tournai,¹¹⁸ this was doubtlessly just one of many possibilities which he was bearing in mind for the future: it would not have been necessary for him to undertake such a long and costly journey simply to ask Eugene for the nomination. Max Braubach rightly remarks moreover that it is unlikely that a quiet life in the peaceful Netherlands would have suited him;¹¹⁹ it is probable that he felt that Eugene's encouraging words of 1718 gave promise of greater things for him at the Prince's court, such as a place of librarian.¹²⁰ That this was Lenglet's aim is, in fact, asserted by a German translator of his Méthode pour étudier l'histoire thirty years later.¹²¹

But there were, inevitably, political intrigues which were possibly the immediate motivation behind Lenglet's departure. Delort mentions an autograph letter, which he unfortunately does not quote in full, dated September 1721, in which Lenglet stated his intention of leaving for Vienna in order to implore the Emperor Charles VI, through the mediation of Eugene, to take steps 'pour mettre[.]à couvert la personne de Sa Majesté, sur laquelle de justes alarmes avoient redoublé'.¹²²

What were the nature and cause of the 'justes alarmes'? In a number of special copies of his Histoire de la monarchie française (1753), which he presented to the King and a few members of the nobility in the hope of getting a belated reward for his services, Lenglet states that the anxieties of the population were due to the serious illness of the young Louis XV;¹²³ this assertion led to his arrest, because, as Malesherbes pointed out to him, his obscure remark could only be interpreted in the light of a 'supposition abominable' that someone was trying to murder the King, a supposition which could not with impunity be voiced aloud.¹²⁴ In order to account for his remarks to Malesherbes, Lenglet wrote two 'Mémoires' in which he tried to explain his statements in a manner acceptable to the Minister.¹²⁵ He declared that he had received information from several foreigners, 'dont il est souvent visité', that Cardinal Albéroni, then installed in Italy, was trying to stir the 'Religionnaires' in the Cévennes into rebellion, his aim still being to capture the Duc d'Orléans, and take over the government of France. Lenglet informed M. Le Blanc on several occasions of what he had heard, but the latter paid scant attention to it.¹²⁶ Since Albéroni's political power had been destroyed with his expulsion from Spain, it is unlikely that even Lenglet could have taken him seriously enough to make such a dramatic personal effort to protect the King against his machinations; it is much more likely that there were other political interests involved, which Lenglet did not care to mention to Malesherbes. We learn that he informed the 'Présidente d'Aligre' of his projected trip, and she encouraged him in his plans:¹²⁷ the question may be asked as to whether Lenglet's Parliamentary connections were involved in the affair, as they had been in his rash action in 1718.

This summer of 1721 was in fact a troubled one for the Jansenist and Parlementarian elements in France, who were greatly worried by the ever-increasing power of Dubois, whom they understandably hated. Knowing that he was determined to get the Cardinal's hat, they did everything in their power to prevent it, fearing a revival of the 'persécution' against them after his promotion. Saint-Simon himself had written against him to Rome.¹²⁸ All to no avail; he received the much-coveted appointment on 18th July, 1721. Was it coincidence that Lenglet set out for Vienna within a couple of months? It is significant that Dubois himself was highly suspicious of Lenglet's movements, for he wrote to the French envoy in Vienna to try and discover whether Lenglet might not have been charged with a secret mission by the Jansenists.¹²⁹ Perhaps then the 'alarmes' which occasioned the abbé's trip were those provoked by the ascendance of Dubois' star; some Parisians may even have gone as far as to suspect the wily Minister of actively attempting to hasten the succession to the throne of his patron, or creature, d'Orléans.

Lenglet set out surreptitiously from Paris in mid-September 1721,¹³⁰ without telling anyone of his intentions, and without a government passport to leave France.¹³¹ He spent two weeks in Lille, where he bought books and manuscripts from a bookseller named Danel, principally for Le Blanc's library. He made a further halt for two weeks in Brussels: here he converted to cash, to cover the cost of his trip, medals to the value of 700 florins, and 300 florins worth of incunabula - which may well have come from Bignon's library - which he sold to 'Sr Antoine Claudinot Libraire sur la Cantersteen'. The medals were bought by a Frenchman, Intendant to the Prince d'Enghien, for the

Princede Rubempré to whom Lenglet was introduced. Through the same person he also met the Dowager Duchesse d'Arenberg; to each of these three he offered copies of his Mémoires sur la collation des canonicats...de Tournai.¹³² We have a third-party account of Lenglet's behaviour in Brussels from Jaupain, Eugene's secret agent, who got his information from the Duchesse d'Arenberg and passed it on to the Prince: apparently Lenglet had boasted 'qu'il alloit à Vienne par commission de V.A.S. [Eugene] faisant entendre qu'elle avoit une entière confiance en lui sur plusieurs affaires'.¹³³ Lenglet's bragging was his undoing; Jaupain immediately wrote to Eugene giving him an account of Lenglet's activities during the last war.¹³⁴ Whatever Lenglet's hopes and plans had been, he was to have a rude awakening when he finally arrived in Vienna on 30th November, 1721.¹³⁵

Apparently he presented himself as a 'Chanoine de Tournay' from the start, and stated 'qu'il était envoyé du chapitre de cette cathédrale pour obtenir la révocation de M. Ernest, qui en avait été nommé doyen par les Hollandais lors de leur régence',¹³⁶ all of which rather belies his statement to Cardinal Dubois that he had gone to Vienna to request a canonicate; he also declared that he had come with books for the Prince.¹³⁷ He naturally requested an audience with Eugene, who refused at first to see him:¹³⁸ the Prince did not want to admit publicly that he had been double-crossed by Lenglet, as he would then be obliged to punish him,¹³⁹ but he was determined to avoid any further involvement. Lenglet had, however, made contact with people in his entourage, including a certain Boyet, his book-binder, son of the 'relieur du Roy' in Paris,¹⁴⁰ and it was through his intercession that Lenglet was finally granted a brief audience on the 16th or 17th December.¹⁴¹ The envoy Dubourg reported back on the occasion:

Il n'a pas parlé de livres à ce Prince, il lui a seulement dit qu'il venoit icy pour les interests du chapitre de Tournay et pour représenter à l'Empereur la nécessité de confirmer la nomination des Etats Generaux pour les Canoncats de Tournay, ou d'en faire une nouvelle en vertu du droit de sa Majesté imperiale egale pour cette Eglise, à celui que le Roy a sur celles de son Roiaume. M. le Prince de Savoye luy a demandé s'il avoit des lettres du Chapitre mais il n'en a point; ¹⁴²

and Eugene himself remarked to the poet Jean-Baptiste Rousseau that 'il a esté receu si sechement qu'il n'est pas revenu'. ¹⁴³ Whatever

secret projects Lenglet had, they undoubtedly hinged on a warm reception by Eugene, and it quickly became obvious to him that they would bear no fruit. All the evidence concerning his stay suggests that after his audience with Eugene he made no further attempt to meet or negotiate with people in positions of power. Moreover, he made up his mind to leave Vienna within a short space of time.

Lenglet's claim, made thirty years later, that he had successfully negotiated with the Emperor on plans to thwart Albéroni's designs, and that the former had actually agreed to send troops to Luxembourg, where they would be ready to defend the person of Louis XV, ¹⁴⁴ is patently untrue. Lenglet was probably at a loss to understand Eugene's cold response to him, but he does not seem to have taken the affront in too personal a manner, for he was warm in his praise of the Prince in the 1729 edition of La Méthode pour étudier l'histoire: ¹⁴⁵ when the censor forced him to delete this panegyric he repeated most of it in his illicit De l'Usage des romans in 1734. ¹⁴⁶

Meanwhile, however, Dubois, who was then Ministre des Affaires Etrangères, had become seriously interested in Lenglet's activities; in mid-February he wrote to his envoy Dubourg in Vienna:

Il seroit important de juger du sujet de la Commission de cet abbé qui a beaucoup de connaissance des Livres à la vérité mais qui n'a aucune droiture. Il y a toute apparence qu'il a été chargé de quelque commission de la part des Jansénistes, et surtout de la

part de ceux qui sont attachés à M. le Cal de Noailles, et j'aurois quelques soupçons qu'il a été chargé de persuader à M. le Pce Eugène d'inspirer à l'Empereur de demander la tenue d'un concile général pour terminer les contestations touchant la constitution qui ont divisé la France et qui peuvent jeter le même trouble dans l'Empire. ¹⁴⁷

Dubourg therefore had Lenglet watched, and also spoke to Jean-Baptiste Rousseau about him. ¹⁴⁸ Rousseau had been banished from France for life in 1712 because of scandalous verses attacking persons in the court circles, which had been attributed to him; in 1715 he had gone to Vienna where Eugene became his protector and patron. It was natural that Lenglet, on arriving in the Austrian capital, should have made contact with his illustrious fellow-countryman. The poet, who was anxious to co-operate with the French administration, reported that Lenglet rarely left his room, and made no great effort to get to know people in positions of power: in fact Rousseau had taken pains to introduce him to important personages such as the Counts Sinzendorff and Oropeza, but Lenglet, though cordially received by them, failed to follow up the acquaintances. ¹⁴⁹ His chief companions were a number of artists, musicians, and painters, mostly of Italian origin, who were attached to the Emperor's court, and with whom he spent his afternoons and evenings. ¹⁵⁰ His mornings were spent in his room working on his Tables chronologiques, as he himself tells us, ¹⁵¹ a fact which can be verified from the Inventory of his papers on his return journey, ¹⁵² and also on the 'premiers poètes de notre langue Villon, Pathelin, Cocquillart, sur les plus anciennes éditions que lui a communiquées Mr Imbert premier Valet de Chambre de S.A.R.'. ¹⁵³ Both Dubourg and Rousseau felt that Lenglet's remarks on the subject of the French government, and on the Unigenitus affair, were too ambiguous to be interpreted as being favourable to any party. Only once did he commit himself in conversation, and that with Garelli, the Emperor's

doctor, who was an avowed and well-known Jansenist:

Il n'y a qu'à M. Garelli qu'il a dit qu'il étoit absolument opposé aux constitutionnaires et que V^{re} Em^{ce} étoit dans le même sentiment, quoi qu'elle favorise ouvertement l'autre parti, et pour mieux convaincre Garelli que lui abbé est Janséniste, il lui a prêté un livre Portugais intitulé Theatrum Jesuiticum, il est si sanglant contre les Jésuites qu'ils ont trouvé moyen d'en supprimer les exemplaires, et l'on ne croit pas qu'il en reste d'autre que celui-ci. M. Garelli l'a fait voir au Prince Eugène qui doit l'avoir acheté moyennant 250 florins, il ne contient qu'un petit volume. ¹⁵⁴

However, this incident does not appear to have convinced Garelli or anyone else that the abbé was a committed Jansenist: Lenglet's real aim appeared to be to sell the book, as he was by that stage badly in need of money. Many, including Rousseau, even wondered if he were not in fact a secret envoy of the Jesuits, ¹⁵⁵ but this is not a suspicion we need take seriously as Lenglet's dislike of Jesuitry is one of the few stable elements in his life. Eugene himself was intrigued by the conflicting rumours, and actually asked Lenglet 's'il n'avoit point écrit contre la Constitution', and on Lenglet's denial he insisted: 'on me l'a dit cependant'. ¹⁵⁶

Dubois was not satisfied with the information he received on Lenglet, and resolved to have him arrested, and his possessions seized, on the return journey. The latter, however, continuously pushed back the date of his departure, the chief reason being that he had no money left and was in daily danger of arrest for failing to pay his board and his valet. ¹⁵⁷ His journey was to be financed by a sum of 100 louis which Eugene had promised for two books offered to him through the intermediary of Garelli, ¹⁵⁸ of which one was presumably the anti-Jesuit publication mentioned above, but there was a long delay in the payment. Lenglet had, moreover, planned to travel to the Netherlands with J.-B. Rousseau, sharing the cost of the trip, but Rousseau, after being approached by

the French envoy Dubourg, became suspicious of Lenglet and the motives which had brought him to Vienna; on Dubourg's suggestion he spoke to the Prince of his doubts. Eugene replied that Lenglet was a 'fort malhonneste homme', whose company Rousseau would be well advised to avoid. Rousseau therefore cooled off in his relations with Lenglet, and made up an excuse for not travelling with him. He also, as we have seen, communicated what he had learnt about Lenglet to Dubourg, and thus, indirectly, to Cardinal Dubois.¹⁵⁹ Lenglet was surprised by Rousseau's sudden change of plan; when he later learnt from Dubois' questions to him after his arrest that Rousseau had reported the conversation with Eugene, he attributed his arrest to the poet's betrayal, a reaction which was not altogether unjustified.¹⁶⁰

Disappointed by Rousseau's refusal to travel with him, Lenglet undertook instead to 'chaperone' a Mademoiselle Léronie as far as Strasbourg; she was the sister-in-law of a painter from Lorraine named Van Schuppen, who had been attached to the Imperial court for the last ten years. She had evidently come to visit him, and was now returning to her family in Lunéville. Van Schuppen apparently advanced Lenglet some money, which helped him to discharge his debts;¹⁶¹ the abbé was finally paid by Eugene around 25th March, and invested some of the money in Morocco leather for covering books;¹⁶² he also bought 'quantité de verreries de Boheme et 12 ou 14 grands Caffetieres de cuivre qu'il a trouvé a meilleur marché qu'en france',¹⁶³ a number of firearms, and a sabre.¹⁶⁴ The wily abbé was obviously well versed in the 'antiques' trade, and did not turn his assets into cash except when absolutely obliged to do so. When he was arrested in Strasbourg, he had only four coffee-pots left;¹⁶⁵ presumably a number of them had already gone to pay expenses along the road.

Lenglet finally left Vienna on 12th April;¹⁶⁶ he must have suspected that he was in danger from the authorities in France, for he pretended that he would take the route through Switzerland, instead of passing through Strasbourg.¹⁶⁷ Rousseau claims that he warned Lenglet to break his journey in the Netherlands and make sure of his welcome before re-entering France, in view of the fact that he had left without a passport, but the truth of this statement may be doubted.¹⁶⁸ In any event, Lenglet's subterfuge was totally ineffectual. On 9th May Dubois wrote to a Comte Dubourg, commandant of the royal troops in Alsace, instructing him to arrest Lenglet on his arrival in Strasbourg, to seize his possessions, and to send all 'lettres, Mémoires et papiers manuscrits' on to Paris.¹⁶⁹ Dubourg acted swiftly: on the evening of the 13th May his men called at the 'cabaret du Boeuf Rouge' where Lenglet had in fact been staying since 28th April.¹⁷⁰ They found that the abbé had gone for a walk outside the town, so they waited for him and arrested him on his return. He was imprisoned in a section of the Fort de la Porte de Pierre, which was not normally put to such use, but where Dubourg assured the Cardinal, 'Ce prisonnier ne souffrira point, dans sa prison, qui est une bonne chambre, ou toutes les nécessités de la vie lui seront fournies, comme il les demandera en payant'.¹⁷¹ Dubourg went on to remark, however, that Lenglet had no money; the owner of the Cabaret du Boeuf had already loaned him five louis d'or on the security of his personal effects, and from Lenglet's own statements it was obvious that he had delayed in Strasbourg mainly to await the arrival of funds from Holland and Paris. His situation was to become critical over the following months as he desperately tried to acquire some money: on the 6th June he wrote to the bookseller Claudinot in Brussels, to whom he had given a box of books in the previous November

for forwarding to the bookseller De Hondt in the Hague; De Hondt had never received the books, and so, of course, Lenglet was having difficulty in extracting payment for them. This autograph letter is in the Archives Etrangères:¹⁷² Dubois, callously disregarding our abbe's plight, did not seemingly bother to send it on to its destination.

If Cardinal Dubois had been hoping to find incriminating letters on Lenglet he was disappointed; as Dubourg pointed out to him, Lenglet had had more than ample time since his arrival in Alsace to put them in the post.¹⁷³ This is precisely what he had done; Mme Van Schuppen, the painter's wife in Lunéville, in an intercepted letter which she wrote to him on 19th May being unaware that he had been arrested, mentioned a 'paquet de lettres' which she had posted for him;¹⁷⁴ presumably the abbé had given the package to Mlle Léronie when they parted ways. Lenglet, of course, when questioned about this, hotly denied that he had ever given her anything to put in the post.¹⁷⁵ Whatever subversive activities may have brought him to Vienna, his report on them was presumably contained in those letters, and is lost to us: our conclusions on the matter must remain largely in the realm of speculation. In the same letter Mme Van Schuppen urged Lenglet to come to Lunéville, from whence 'on feroit savoir à S.A.R. que vous y êtes'; this would appear to refer to Léopold, d'uc de Lorraine, to whose court the Van Schuppen were attached. Perhaps Lenglet had hoped to use this contact in some way to placate the French authorities, and avoid arrest on his return to Paris.

As to the inventory which Dubourg had drawn up and sent to Dubois, it gives us an interesting insight into Lenglet's business and

literary occupations at that moment. The works on which he had been concentrating in Vienna have been mentioned above: the manuscript entitled 'Tables chronologiques de l'histoire universelle' was found among his papers, apparently in finished form, and it was remarked that 'cette pièce paraît fort savante'.¹⁷⁶ There were six cardboard portfolios containing catalogues of all sorts of books; commentaries on works, especially in the field of history, presumably by Lenglet and intended for his bibliographies; printed geographical maps; some 'vers gaulois'; and 'plusieurs cahiers de remarques sur l'histoire d'Egypte et autres pièces antiques, et curieuses'.¹⁷⁷ This latter item is of particular interest, as it may well be a copy of the articles from Boulainvillier's Histoire universelle which Lenglet was to use in the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire of 1729.¹⁷⁸ There was also a large trunk filled mainly with books, which, together with other volumes which he had given to various booksellers for binding, had been catalogued by Lenglet. Along with the items of hardware mentioned above, these represent the tools of Lenglet's many trades; he had an amazing capacity for keeping his activities as writer, book-agent, bibliographer, antiquarian, and political schemer all ticking over at the same time. He shows proof of a phenomenal organisational ability which partly explains his immense productivity as writer, editor and bibliographer.

The details of Lenglet's imprisonment can be gleaned from the exchange of letters between Strasbourg and Paris over the best part of the following year. Up to 10th July Dubourg was left in ignorance as to how he was supposed to deal with the prisoner: he wrote to the Minister Dubois that Lenglet was in danger of dying of hunger, since no-one was pre-

pared to lend him any more money. Moreover the place in which he was being detained was unsuitable for the purpose, and he had almost succeeded in escaping. He asked that Lenglet be transferred to a royal prison.¹⁷⁹ Dubois finally replied, making provision for Lenglet's subsistence, and giving Dubourg a list of questions to be posed to the prisoner, following which he would either be released, or transferred to the prison in Besançon.¹⁸⁰ It was in response to these questions that Lenglet wrote the three lengthy documents preserved in the Archives Etrangères, and which recount his trip and life in Vienna in great detail. But his remarks on the religious and political situation were understandably guarded, and cast no great light on his own rôle and attitudes.

These lengthy reports failed to satisfy Dubois, for in September we find Lenglet still languishing in his prison, where he has been suffering from a fever for six weeks,¹⁸¹ an ailment which Dubourg finally thought serious enough to call in a doctor.¹⁸² On Dubois' accession to the status of Prime Minister, Lenglet wrote in an effort to gain his good graces by offering information about a certain Chevalier Schaub, who was on intimate terms with the Cardinal, and had been instrumental in the latter's negotiations with England,¹⁸³ he claimed that the rumours of war which had come to his ears had urged him to this action. Lenglet stated that the Comte de Hoym, envoy of King Augustus of Poland, with whom he had been friendly in Paris, had told him that Schaub 'tout en folatrant et en badinant auprès de S.E. en tiroit des Secrets tres Importants Et que les Ministres meme du Roy auroient peine a decouvrir', which the Chevalier then communicated to Hoym. Lenglet added that he himself had often seen the two speaking privately, Schaub dictating information which Hoym

passed on to his superiors. Lenglet finished by offering his further services to Dubois, presumably in the kind of activity in which he was at that moment indulging, an offer which the Cardinal understandably ignored. In January 1723 Lenglet wrote again, begging that he be taken to Paris where he could have an habitual illness looked after, and where he could give the Cardinal an 'entière justification' of his conduct.¹⁸⁴

Dubois finally responded, betraying what was perhaps his true reason for keeping Lenglet imprisoned for so long: he wanted to find out what had happened to the books stolen from Law's (Bignon's) library which he, Dubois, had bought. He asked firstly that if Lenglet had the Catalogue, he should send it on, or if not he should indicate who did have it, and could communicate it to Dubois. Secondly, Lenglet was asked:

De donner connaissance de tous les Livres qui ont été distraits et detournés et où ils se peuvent trouver, non pas qu'on veuille user d'autorité ni de force pour les recouvrer, ni rendre M l'abbé Langlet responsable de ce qui a pu avoir passé par ses mains.

If Lenglet replied truthfully he would merit his liberty, 'et même des graces'.¹⁸⁵ Unfortunately we do not have Lenglet's reply to the request, but on 7th May Dubois wrote again to Dubourg, saying that Lenglet's indications had been of some help, but that:

Elle[s] n'ont pas donné tous les éclaircissemens dont j'ay besoin, et qu'il peut me donner pour recouvrer les Livres detachés de la Bibliothèque de M Law, que j'ay acquise. Je vous supplie, Monsieur, de l'exhorter a me satisfaire sur le memoire ci joint et a me donner toutes les autres connoissances qui me sont necessaires pour remplacer les Livres qui ont esté pris de cette Bibliothèque sans qu'il puisse craindre que je veuille inquieter personne, mais seulement retrouver a l'amiable, même a force d'argent ce qui peut remettre cette Bibliothèque dans le premier état ou elle étoit.

Dubois reiterated that Lenglet could expect a worthwhile reward if he complied with his wishes, and finished by asking Dubourg to excuse

these importunities 'que la seule passion des Livres peut excuser'.¹⁸⁶ It is evident from what we are told above of Lenglet's response that he was guilty at least of complicity in the disappearance of the books; it is unfortunate that we do not have more detail about the nature and extent of his involvement.

We have no further documentation of Lenglet's situation, with the exception of one letter from Dubourg published by Ravaisson, and undoubtedly written on 15th May, 1723;¹⁸⁷ it shows that Lenglet once again wrote a 'Mémoire' in reply to the Cardinal's questions. The Comte Dubourg, as in all previous correspondence, stated his belief that Lenglet had responded with the best of goodwill, and asked that he be summoned to the capital; but according to Delort it was not until October 1723 that the abbé was allowed to return to Paris.¹⁸⁸ In the uncensored copies of his Histoire de la monarchie française (1753), commenting on Dubois' death on 11th August, 1723, Lenglet stated:

Je puis dire ici ce que j'appris en 1723 à Strasbourg de M. le Comte du Bourg [...] qu'on avoit trouvé dans les papiers de ce Cardinal des Mémoires, qui tendoient à perdre le Duc Régent son bienfaicteur. Cela ne dois pas étonner,¹⁸⁹

which remark suggests that he was still a prisoner at that time. It may well be, then, that he owed his release simply to the death of the Cardinal; small wonder that Lenglet detested him, and seized every chance to criticise him in his writings.

It seems certain, therefore, that Lenglet's imprisonment lasted for well over a year. He was, as we have seen, ill for at least part of that time; but he does not appear to have been treated with anything but sympathy and courtesy by the Comte Dubourg. We have seen above that the latter continually tried to procure his release, and was apparent-

ly friendly enough to discuss even the affairs of the government with the suspected spy. It also transpired that Dubourg invited him to meet Count Passionei, then Papal Nuncio to Switzerland, when the latter visited Strasbourg in 1723.¹⁹⁰ But the way in which the administration in Paris seems to have almost ignored his existence after the first few months must have been difficult to bear, and he may well have wondered at times if he would be left to end his days in the remote provinces. Whatever the original purpose of his trip, it was hardly successful from any point of view; it had proved extremely costly, exhausting the abbé's already slim resources. In later years, when he was seeking a reward from the king for his alleged services at this time, he claimed to have spent 9,000 livres on the expedition, which is undoubtedly an exaggeration; but from the various transactions which we have seen him carry out it is nonetheless clear that the costs did run to several thousands of livres.¹⁹¹

One of Lenglet's first actions on his return to Paris was to edit a volume of the items which J.-B. Rousseau had deliberately avoided publishing under his own name. They included one comedy, a number of epigrams and other poems of a highly scabrous nature. They formed a volume of 166 pages in duodecimo, and were presented as a Supplément to the Oeuvres diverses de M. Rousseau, published in London by Tonson and Watts in two volumes quarto in 1723.¹⁹² Curiously, there were in fact two distinct editions bearing the same colophon, one of which was genuinely published in England, while the other seems to have originated in Holland or the Netherlands. The latter was probably the first edition, for we have no other evidence to suggest that Lenglet had direct contact with publishers in England. By an ironic twist the

original edition would therefore appear to have been pirated by that same Tonson and Watts whose name had been used as a subterfuge by the original printer. The Supplément was not attributed to Lenglet by the early biographers, but the attribution in later catalogues is highly plausible:¹⁹³ the editor signed himself 'Mr D.', and remarked in his preface that he had taken care to eliminate all those pieces which had been falsely attributed to Rousseau, adding that:

Ce choix s'est fait avec une exactitude, et une fidélité, dont on a des preuves qui pourraient passer pour démonstrations s'il était permis de les révéler au Public. ¹⁹⁴

Lenglet, who had been close to Rousseau and his circle for a number of months, had been ideally placed to establish what had, in fact, come from the poet's pen. We have already indicated the reasons which Lenglet had to feel aggrieved with Rousseau; it would not be in the least surprising that on his release from prison he should seize this opportunity of discomfiting the poet while at the same time reaping a financial benefit for himself. The desire for revenge was later to push him to make more serious attacks on Rousseau.

Lenglet's political star wanes: death of Le Blanc

Lenglet's family was no doubt relieved to hear of his release in October, but their worries were not over, for it will be remembered that the profligate brother Antoine was arrested for theft in November of this same year, 1723.¹⁹⁵ We have also seen that Jacques, who went by the name of de Percel, seems to have been forced to leave France around this time, and was to spend the rest of his life in Brussels.¹⁹⁶

And a more serious crisis was arising which was to engulf the de la Barre , and even Lenglet himself, early in 1724.

Claude Le Blanc had for long been a close and devoted servant of the Regent, too close for him not to have provoked the jealousy of other courtiers who were biding their time to bring about his downfall.

Saint-Simon wrote in 1722:

[Le Blanc] étoit depuis longtemps à toutes mains de M. le duc d'Orléans, et employé seul dans toutes les choses les plus secrètes. Il étoit souple, ductile, plein de ressources et d'expédients, le plus ingénieux homme pour la mécanique des diverses sortes d'exécutions, où il étoit employé sans cesse, enfin l'homme à tout faire du cardinal Dubois, tellement dans sa confiance qu'il l'avoit attirée à Belle-Isle, et que tous deux depuis longtemps passaient tous les soirs les dernières heures du cardinal Dubois chez lui, en tiers, à résumer, agiter, consulter et résoudre la plupart des affaires. Tel en étoit l'extérieur et très ordinairement même le réel. Mais avec toute cette confiance, Le Blanc étoit trop en possession de celle du Régent pour que le cardinal pût s'en accommoder longtemps.¹⁹⁷

There were other more open and more active enemies than Dubois: Madame de Prie, mistress of the Duc de Bourbon, detested Le Blanc because he was one of her mother's lovers; the enmity between Madame de Pléneuf and her daughter was such that they were prepared to take any steps to destroy each other's power and influence. Throughout the year 1722 Madame de Prie urged Bourbon to attack Le Blanc; to attain her end she used the ambitious Paris brothers, who sought to accuse the Minister of embezzlement and corruption in the execution of his post.¹⁹⁸ Already in July 1722 there were fears that Le Blanc was about to lose his office;¹⁹⁹ in December of the same year the accounts of one of the Minister's treasurers, a man named La Jonchère, were examined by the commissioners; they were found to be irregular, La Jonchère having used paper billets to pay the officers instead of the cash which had been claimed for in the budget. It was said he had been given orders

to that effect by Le Blanc.²⁰⁰ Moreover, one of La Jonchère's caissiers had been found, presumed murdered, in a river below the latter's house; it was suggested that he had been killed in an effort to hide the embezzlement of funds from which Le Blanc and his close associate Belle-Isle had profited.²⁰¹ The Duc de Bourbon, soon joined by Dubois, began to clamour for explanations and to demand that Le Blanc be called to account for his deeds. At first the Regent resisted the pressure, and declared publicly in February 1723 that Le Blanc's conduct had been totally justified in his eyes.²⁰² But the Pâris returned to the attack with further accusations against Le Blanc's treasurers; Marais recounts:

Ils se portent pour dénonciateurs et font ce personnage à la face de toute la France; ils se soumettent au talion si l' accusation est fausse. Cette affaire fait grand bruit et partage tout le monde. ²⁰³

Gradually the Regent's faith began to be shaken: in August 1723 Le Blanc was put under surveillance. But once again Philippe, choosing to judge the case himself, decided in Le Blanc's favour.²⁰⁴

However in December 1723 the Regent died, and the Duc de Bourbon took over the reins of power as Premier Ministre; Le Blanc had lost his most powerful protector, for it was clear that Dubois would not be prepared to defend him. On 7th March Le Blanc was arrested and taken to the Bastille,²⁰⁵ as the Comte de Belle-Isle had been on the previous day. The general reaction was one of sympathy for the Minister; he was highly popular with the officers, to whom he had always rendered service.²⁰⁶ In keeping with the description of his character given by Saint-Simon, he had not only been careful to win the support of his subordinates, but he had likewise safeguarded his public image, leaving his post 'fort peu riche en apparence', although he had managed to

marry his daughter to the Marquis de Tresnel, 'homme de condition et fort riche'.²⁰⁷ The charges brought against him were many, though some were never clearly formulated; unfortunately his whole dossier was removed from the Archives de la Bastille, leaving only a file-cover stating that he had been arrested 'pour raison connue du Roi',²⁰⁸ and so the details of the affair remain rather obscure. The three major charges he had to answer were as follows:

- 1° d'avoir donné du papier aux troupes et d'avoir retenu douze ou quinze cent mille livres;
- 2° d'avoir fait faire un faux registre par Sandrié, commis de La Jonchère, et d'avoir fait ensuite assassiner Sandrié à cause, dit-on, que M. le duc d'Orléans aurait détourné les fonds portés sur ce registre;
- 3° d'avoir donné à La Barre, exempt de Paris, un ordre d'enterrer un particulier, qui était sous la garde de cet exempt, et qui s'était pendu derrière la porte de la chambre où il était détenu.²⁰⁹

The de la Barre mentioned here was none other than Lenglet's brother-in-law. The accusation concerned a certain La Combe, 'receveur des deniers', who had been arrested for an unspecified misdemeanour by order of Le Blanc, and held prisoner by de la Barre in his own house.²¹⁰ An officer who was detained there at the same time witnessed that he had shared meals with La Combe for a fortnight, and that they had been well treated; but one morning he heard Madame de la Barre screaming, and on going to her aid was led to La Combe's room where the latter was lying dead at the foot of his bed with a rope around his neck. It was the officer's opinion that the man could not have hung himself with the rope which was attached to the low bedstead. He was still in the room when Le Blanc had arrived with de la Barre, and the Minister told him to leave the house immediately.²¹¹ La Combe's mistress also gave witness that when she had gone to the Duc d'Orléans to ask for his release, the Regent had replied: 'On se défera bientôt de ton Gazan de la Combe, et il ne te fera plus de mal'.²¹² Marais summed up the case as follows:

C'est à Le Blanc qui avait donné l'ordre de l'arrêter qu'on fait remonter la cause de sa mort: n'avait-il pas la veille soupé avec joie, dansé et joué du violon chez La Barre. Celui-ci se défend par l'ordre qu'il a reçu d'arrêter, et le ministre par l'ordre verbal que lui a donné le Régent et qui est exprimé dans sa lettre, et on affirme que cet homme s'est pendu lui-même. Selon le droit public, le Roi est juge. Il peut faire arrêter et même tuer en crime d'Etat. Le Roi peut juger sur-le-champ, à mort, sans formalité, comme on a vu le roi Henri III juger le duc et le cardinal de Guise à Blois, et Louis XIII le maréchal d'Ancre. Ainsi on pouvait avoir fait tuer cet homme en crime d'Etat, mais cela est bien délicat chez un Régent. ²¹³

De la Barre together with his immediate superior du Chevron, 'procureur Général de la connétablie', were arrested on 23rd March and imprisoned in Vincennes. ²¹⁴ On the same day, Marguerite Lenglet, de la Barre's wife, was taken to the Bastille. ²¹⁵ On the 25th the abbé himself was apprehended and incarcerated in the formidable Donjon de Vincennes. ²¹⁶ The main charge against him was the publication of a 'Memoire jugé séditieux' ²¹⁷ in defense of Le Blanc, but no doubt it was also hoped to prove involvement with his sister and her husband in other activities. Unfortunately, I have been unable to find a copy of the 'Mémoire' in question, which was described by Marais in a letter to Bouhier in 1728 in the following terms:

Il m'est tombé entre les mains un écrit de cinquante pages grand in-quarto bien imprimé, qui a pour titre Défense de Monsieur Le Blanc. Il a été fort peu vu et a été donné à peu de gens dans le temps du procès. On y fait un grand éloge de ce ministre et de tout ce qu'il a fait avant de l'être, et entre autres la construction du fort de Mardik, qui paroît un ouvrage des dieux. Puis il y a des portraits affreux d'Arnaud de Boesse et de l'abbé Margon, qui sont bien représentés, et la matière de l'accusation assez bien débrouillée, pour un homme qui n'est pas du métier. L'abbé Lenglet est auteur de cette défense, à ce que l'on m'a assuré, et c'est une pièce à mettre dans votre trésor, si vous la pouvez avoir. On n'a fait que me la prêter, je l'ai dévorée. ²¹⁸

Lenglet had evidently not wasted time in preparing his defence of his patron, which must have been drafted even before the latter's arrest, if not on his express orders.

The guilt or innocence of the arrested parties is difficult to

establish. It is evident that Le Blanc's enemies were prepared to use any weapons, whether real or imaginary, against him. Their methods are demonstrated by the way in which the above-named Arnaud de Bouëx tried to fabricate evidence against the de la Barre. He had a prisoner named Lochon, widow of Gaudron, brought to the Bastille to serve as 'mouton' and draw information from Madame de la Barre, but instead she sent a complaint to the authorities about the way in which she had been treated:

Elle [Lochon] accuse ce magistrat [de Bouëx] d'avoir voulu la séduire, de lui avoir offert de l'argent, enfin d'avoir employé tous les moyens imaginables, jusqu'à la menacer d'être envoyée pour le reste de ses jours aux Isles Sainte-Marguerite, et ce, afin de l'engager à déposer que M. de Launey, gouverneur de la Bastille, l'avait priée de ne rien révéler de ce qu'elle apprendrait de la dame de La Barre. M. Arnaud vouloit faire déposer à cette femme que la dame de La Barre lui avait confié que l'on avait porté de l'or et de l'argent au Palais-Royal, cela du temps que Law y étoit caché, et que M. Le Blanc en avait fait sortir une nuit des sommes considérables par l'hôtel d'Esfiat et les avait fait conduire par les soins de M. du Chevron, procureur général de la connétablie, du s. de La Barre, son premier lieutenant, et Javelle, à la terre de Belle-Isle, incognito, et que M. le duc d'Orléans étant venu à mourir sans s'expliquer, ceux qui avaient cet argent l'avaient gardé. Suivant ce que la nommée Lochon dit dans son mémoire, M. Le Blanc étoit accusé en outre d'avoir envoyé le s. de La Barre dans les marchés pour faire enchérir les grains, sous prétexte d'affaires du roi; d'avoir donné à Mme de Pléneuf, sa maîtresse, pour plus de deux millions d'actions de celles que le roi avait destinées pour les officiers; qu'un prisonnier qu'il avait mis chez ledit sieur de La Barre avait été étranglé par ses ordres, par l'exécuteur que M. le lieutenant criminel avait mené avec lui, accompagné de trois personnes pour aider dans cette affaire; que le corps étant froid, on l'avait fait accrocher dans la chambre, avec des ficelles à pain de sucre, comme s'il se fût pendu lui-même et que cela s'étoit fait par ordre de M. le Régent. 219

The false evidence which de Bouëx tried to fabricate on all these heads shows that the charges were, at the least, exaggerated.

On the other hand, it is certain that there was some irregularity in the financial administration of Le Blanc's department; La Jonchère, while cleared of the charge of murder, was found guilty in April 1724

of embezzling almost three million livres of royal funds,²²⁰ a part of which Le Blanc and Belle-Isle were asked to repay.²²¹ But this represents a level of dishonesty common among the administrators of the ancien régime: La Jonchère was just unlucky to have become mixed up in a political quarrel. De la Barre's own fortune, as those of many of his kind, can hardly have been constituted simply from honest gains and the buying of charges; the rewards for the kind of services he rendered Le Blanc were certainly not limited to the salary of a Lieutenant de la connétablie'. But is it likely that he, or Le Blanc, would have been involved in the murders of which they were accused? I have already mentioned the number of ambiguous, not to say criminal characters whom the Minister employed as his agents;²²² around this time one of his spies, a certain Menq, 'homme d'ailleurs reconnu pour fripon et à demi convaincu d'assassinats', was arrested as he tried to leave Marseille, and the Maréchal de Villars commented that 'M. Le Blanc n'était pas excusable sur le commerce qu'il avoit eu avec ces misérables, capables de tous crimes'.²²³ We have proof in the documents relating to Lenglet's activities in 1710 that Le Blanc was actually considering having Jaupain, Eugene's agent, 'disappear' quietly.²²⁴ He was a man therefore who was not particularly squeamish about the means he employed in the execution of his duties; and it is not inconceivable that he should have had La Combe killed in the interests of the Regent. However, we have no proof to enable us to decide definitely on the foundation of any of the charges, either in relation to Le Blanc or to de la Barre; we can only make judgement on the political motivations behind their arrest and trial.

The way in which the case was handled proved, in fact, to be extremely

lucky for Le Blanc. The Duc de la Feuillade, certain that Le Blanc did not have a chance of escaping condemnation, convinced Bourbon that he should allow him to be judged by the whole Parlement, because 'M. le Duc avait intérêt qu'un jugement certainement à mort ne fust pas suspect comme il le serait toujours par des commissaires'.²²⁵ The case opened on the 8th January 1725 before a crowded court. Three of Le Blanc's enemies, the Ducs de la Feuillade, de Villars-Brancas, and de Richelieu, were present as judges, an extraordinary action and one which Saint-Simon regarded as totally unfitting for a Pair de France;²²⁶ they were moreover mocked in a number of popular songs.²²⁷ The Duc d'Orléans, realising that there would be attempts to drag his father's name in the dirt, presented himself as Le Blanc's defender, accompanied by the Duc de Conti. After nine hearings, the Parlement declared Le Blanc innocent of the three charges which they had been called to judge. The Duc de Villars remarked with more than a hint of sour grapes:

Le parlement entier traita de bagatelles les trois chefs d'accusation, oublia que Le Blanc avoit été le plus intime confident de feu M. d'Orléans, qui avoit assez maltraité le parlement, que c'étoit même lui qui avoit fait toutes les lettres de cachet pour l'envoyer à Blois, quoique ce fût à M. de Maurepas, secrétaire d'Etat, ayant la ville de Paris dans son département, à les expédier; que c'étoit M. Le Blanc qui avoit ce grand nombre d'espions contre lesquels on avoit paru si animé. Enfin, dans cette occasion, le parlement montra combien il pense différemment sur un ministre en place et sur un ministre disgracié, et le peu de penchant qu'il a toujours fait voir pour ce qui s'appelle premier ministre.²²⁸

By the same judgement de la Barre was cleared of the charges against him.²²⁹ They were not released however, as Bourbon was still hoping to prove negligence and incompetence on Le Blanc's part in the running of the war department, and he named a bureau to examine his administration in detail.²³⁰ But in May of this year, 1725, he finally gave in to the pressure of public opinion and Le Blanc was released from the Château de Vincennes to which he had earlier been transferred;²³¹ he

was ordered to retire to Lisieux. Urbain de la Barre and his wife Marguerite were released on the 23rd of the following August.²³²

Meanwhile, Lenglet had spent over a year in Vincennes, where for part of the time he was a fellow-prisoner of Le Blanc's. He later stated in his Histoire de la monarchie française (1753) that he had helped Le Blanc to communicate with the outside world:

Un de ses amis prisonnier aussi bien que lui et pour lui dans ce dernier Château, lui donna moyen de communiquer avec sa famille et du fond de sa prison, il conduisit secrettement son affaire que M. le Duc avoit sagement renvoyée au Parlement.²³³

That it is Lenglet himself this passage refers to is confirmed in a letter from one of his friends to his biographer shortly after his death, where he recounts how Lenglet had once read him the passages from the book which relate his own adventures, including that which describes 'les moyens dont il se servit pour faire sortir M. Le Blanc, son intime ami, de la Bastille'.²³⁴ He was less successful in securing his own release however; on 29th June 1725 he was moved from Vincennes to the Bastille,²³⁵ and here he remained long after his sister and her husband were freed. He was however allowed to see Marguerite about their 'affaires domestiques et de famille', though only in the presence of Arnaud de Bouëx,²³⁶ as had been the case when he had been given permission to see other members of his family at Vincennes in March 1725.²³⁷ We have an interesting letter which he wrote to his sister, dated 8th February 1726,²³⁸ in the belief that their correspondence was being successfully smuggled past the guards in the covers of books which she had permission to send him. In fact, the authorities were confiscating his letters and sending copies - possibly with an altered text - to his sister. In this letter he enquired how Marguerite's efforts to secure his release through the Marquis de Breteuil, who had replaced

Le Blanc as Secrétaire d'Etat de la Guerre, and René Hérault, Lieutenant Général de Police, were progressing. He expressed his opinion on the reasons for his continued detention as follows:

Il me paraît par la conduite qu'il [le gouverneur] tient à mon égard que je ne suis détenu que comme homme de confiance de M. Le Blanc Tel que m'a voulu faire passer Arnaut de B. ... L'acharnement contre nous vient de ce qu'on a trouvé M. Le Blanc entièrement innocent, et S^t Sauveur me le lacha sans y penser, lorsque je lui dis que cette affaire me paroissoit bien longue; il me dit que si on avoit trouvé des coupables cela auroit bien plutôt fini. On a trompé M. le Duc en tout et comme il ne peut rien voir par lui même des Impressions restent et produisent toujours le même mal.

He went on to express his worries concerning other members of his family, particularly his brother Jacques who must be warned not to return to France for fear of treachery on the part of de Bouëx, that 'ennemi secret et outré de la protection que nous a accordé M. Le Blanc'.²³⁹

Madame de la Barre faithfully kept up her efforts to help her brother: In a letter of April 1726 she asked Hérault that Lenglet be granted permission to take walks, as his health was failing from an imprisonment of two years, which favour was granted.²⁴⁰ It was on the 17th/18th of this same month that Voltaire was also incarcerated in the Château as a result of his quarrel with the Chevalier de Rohan-Chabot;²⁴¹ there must have been some contact between the two men, for Voltaire, who had powerful friends, undertook to solicit Lenglet's pardon after his own release, a promise to which he apparently adhered.²⁴² In fact Lenglet's release came shortly afterwards, on the 25th/26th June,²⁴³ it was primarily a sequel to the political crisis which brought about Bourbon's downfall and exile on 14th June 1726,²⁴⁴ and the transfer of effective power to the King's tutor Fleury. Le Blanc was immediately re-

called, and entered Paris triumphantly to be greeted with flowers by the people of the city.²⁴⁵ He undoubtedly then proceeded to have his sympathisers released from prison; it was the turn of his accusers the Pâris brothers to face charges of embezzlement as the power of their protector faded into nothingness.²⁴⁶

Le Blanc restored to his charge of Secrétaire d'Etat de la Guerre, Lenglet continued to serve him as he had done before; but he did not profit for long from the new-found security of his patron, for two years later the Minister died.²⁴⁷ This was in many ways a major turning-point in Lenglet's life; although he had published or edited a number of works which had won the approbation of a learned public, and established his name internationally as both scholar and bibliographer, up to now the greater part of his time and energy had been spent in non-literary pursuits. In the period 1714-1728, that is from the age of forty to fifty-four, we have seen that he published relatively little and oriented himself, whether consciously or not, towards an active career in the diplomatic/political area. But he lacked either the reliability, or the flair for spotting the right opportunity, which were essential ingredients for success in such activities; since he continually threw himself impetuously into lost causes it is little wonder that he was highly suspect to the successive ruling administrations, and that he failed to find a second Le Blanc willing to trust and protect him.

A total of five years of this period of his maturity had been spent in prisons. However, as he himself tells us on several occasions, he always put his detentions to good use in the pursuance of his studies and the

elaboration of his literary projects,²⁴⁸ and it is perhaps paradoxically thanks to these enforced periods of calm that he was not left altogether empty-handed at the death of Le Blanc. The year 1728 in fact sees the beginning of a period of immense productivity. Notwithstanding a few further diplomatic engagements, from this point on the abbé's literary activity gradually took over as the primary, though still far from the sole activity of his life.

Notes to Chapter III

1. Claude Le Blanc (1669-1728), son of a Maître des requêtes, was the Intendant whom Lenglet had invoked as a witness to his innocence on his arrest in Flanders (see Chapter II, p.76). On Le Blanc's appointment to the Conseil de Guerre in 1715 the Marquis de Dangeau remarked: 'Ce dernier a fait tant de bruit dans le monde que ce seroit vouloir s'engager dans de véritables Mémoires que d'entreprendre d'en parler' (Le Journal du Marquis de Dangeau, Paris, Didot, 1854-60, xvi, 186). Lenglet's fortunes were to a large extent linked to Le Blanc's up to the latter's death. Cf. Victor Swarte, Un intendant, secrétaire d'état au XVIIIe siècle, Claude Le Blanc, Dunkerque, Imprimerie Dunkerquoise, 1900.
2. Letter to Passionei, 19 Mar. 1714, Vat.Lat.9815, f.38.
3. Cf. Chapter I, note 43.
4. Cf. addresses given in her Constitution de rentes, Minutier LXVII, 308, 20 Mar. 1715 and her marriage contract, Minutier LXVII, 330, 27 Jan. 1719.
5. Cf. p.118 below re de La Barre's part in the Ferrand and Lenglet arrests.
6. Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 140, f.306, document dated 20 Jul. 1722, written during Lenglet's imprisonment in Strasbourg.
7. On the library see Gabriel Martin, Catalogue des livres de la bibliothèque de feu M. Le Blanc, secrétaire d'état, Paris, Martin, 1729; the library was sold for 40,000 livres. According to Swarte, 3,143 out of the 5,700 volumes were in the field of history (op.cit., p.38).
8. Mathieu Marais, Journal et mémoires sur la régence et le règne de Louis XV, ed. de Lescure, Paris, 1863-8, II, 311. Voltaire was convinced that the officer in question had formerly denounced him to the authorities. Marais recounts: 'On dit qu'Arouët, qui est hardi, auroit dit à M. Le Blanc, Ministre de la Guerre, chez qui il avoit vu cet officier à table. Je savois bien qu'on payait les espions, mais je ne savois pas encore que leur récompense étoit de manger à la table du ministre'. The result was that the officer stopped Voltaire's chaise at the pont de Sèvres and gave him a thrashing, marking his face. Marais adds: 'J'ai su que cet officier ayant dit son dessein à M. le Blanc, lequel dessein allait même jusqu'à assommer le poète, M. Leblanc lui dit: "Fais donc en sorte qu'on n'en voye rien."' This is one of many indications of Le Blanc's rather devious character.
9. See below, p.149 and Chapter V, pp.314-5.
10. See below, Chapter V, pp.293 ff.

11. See Voltaire's Correspondance, ed. Theodore Besterman, 2nd edition, Banbury, Voltaire Foundation, 1968-76, letters D1715, D2744, D2802 and D4826.
12. Jean-Aimar Piganiol de la Force (1673-1753) was tutor to the 'pages du Comte de Toulouse', and published several works on geography. He collaborated with the abbé Nadal in publishing the Nouveau Mercure from 1708-11. The Description géographique et historique de la France, 1715, 5 vols., was his most famous work; it was augmented and reprinted many times (cf. Biog.univers., xxxiii, 300-1).
13. See Méthode pour étudier la géographie, ed. 1716, i, p.lxxxi.
14. Abbé Augustin Nadal (1659-1741), was attached to the service of the Duc d'Aumont; he had been secretary in the French embassy at Utrecht at the time of the treaty, where Lenglet may equally well have met him. He wrote five tragedies and a number of long poems (Biog.univers., xxx, 5-6).
15. Cf. Chapter I, p.9.
16. Reported in Mathieu Marais, Journal et mémoires, iii, 140 (Swarte, op.cit., p.213).
17. Jérôme Pichon, Vie de Charles-Henry Comte de Hoym, Paris, Techener, 1880, i, 17. Anne Bellinzani (1658-1740), wife of Michel Ferrand, Président au Parlement, was the daughter of a financier of Italian origin who died under charges of embezzlement. She had an affair with the Baron de Breteuil, whom she later rejected, and who avenged himself by publishing her letters to him in the Histoire des amours de Cléante et de Belise, avec le recueil de ses lettres, Leyde, 1691 (Dict.de biog.franç., xiii, 1066-7). In his De l'Usage des romans (ii, 100) Lenglet refers to her as a 'Dame d'un très grand mérite'. See below, pp.115 ff., re Lenglet's involvement with her in 1718.
18. Pichon, op.cit., i, 216.
19. 1694-1736; on his career see Pichon, op.cit.
20. See the Dedication to Hoym in Lenglet's edition of the Oeuvres de Marot. Gabriel Martin published the Catalogue librorum bibliothecae ...Caroli Henrici comitis de Hoym, Paris, 1738.
21. Delort, Détention des philosophes, p.63.
22. See Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 140, f.308, and Autriche 141, f.120.
23. See Pichon, op.cit., p.34.
24. Delort, op.cit., p.63.
25. Ibid., pp.52, 57 and 63.
26. Pierre Daniel Huet (1630-1721) had been appointed sous-précepteur to the Grand Dauphin, under the direction of Bossuet, in 1670. In

1692 he was appointed bishop of Avranches, but he resigned his see soon afterwards to retire to the maison professe of the Jesuits to whom he donated his library; for the last twenty years of his life he devoted himself to study, and attended the meetings of the Académie Française with great assiduity (Biog.univers., xx, 101-5).

27. Delort, op.cit., p.67. See also Lenglet's notes in Gachet d'Artigny, Nouveaux mémoires..., i, 404, and De l'Usage des romans, i, 197, where he says he knew Huet well. In the Supplément aux Mémoires de Condé, on the contentious question of whether the Duc d'Espernon had tried to stop the murder of the regicide Ravaillac, Lenglet declared: 'Je ne puis désavouer que cette circonstance ayant été examinée dans une des Conférences, qui se tenoient chez M. Huet, ancien Evêque d'Avranche, il nous assura que suivant une copie exacte, qu'il avoit du Procès de Ravaillac, différente des imprimés, cela ne pouvoit être' (p.xxii).
28. See Lenglet's note in d'Artigny, op.cit., i, 407.
29. Born in the state of Venice, Jean Oliva (1689-1757) had published several erudite dissertations before he was drawn to Rome c.1719, where he became a protégé of Pope Clement XI. It was in 1721, during the conclave after the latter's death, that Oliva met Rohan who persuaded the abbé to return to Paris with him.
30. Jeanne d'Arc, 1753-4 ed., i, pp.xxv-vi.
31. Henri de Boulainvilliers (or Boulainviller), comte de Saint-Saire (1658-1722), was a son of one of the great noble families of France, whose fortunes were ruined by his father's neglect. Having studied at the Oratorian College at Juilly under Richard Simon, he devoted his life of provincial retirement to study, and the composition of works which were largely intended for the education of his children or for distribution in manuscript among his intellectual circle in Paris. Imbued with the critical methods of Simon, and strongly influenced by the writings of Spinoza, the count's works on history and philosophy testify to a great intellectual honesty and rigour. See Paul Vernière, Spinoza et la pensée française avant la Révolution, Paris, P.U.F., 1954, pp.306-21 and *passim*.; Renée Simon, Henri de Boulainviller, Paris, Boivin, 1942, and A la recherche d'un homme et d'un auteur. Essai de bibliographie des ouvrages du comte de Boulainviller, Paris, Boivin, n.d., 52pp.; Ira O. Wade, The clandestine organization and diffusion of philosophic ideas in France from 1700 to 1750, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1938, pp.97-123 and *passim*.
32. Fréret (1688-1749) had already attained by 1707 such a reputation for scholarship that he was invited to join the unofficial académie at the Hôtel de Noailles of which Boulainvilliers was a member (cf. Renée Simon, Nicolas Fréret, académicien, (Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, xvii), pp.14-15. The only information available on the little académie at the Hôtel de Rohan is published in Robert Shackleton's Montesquieu, p.61, and in Montesquieu's correspondence: see Oeuvres complètes de Montesquieu, ed. Masson, Paris, Nagel, 1955, iii, 783-4 and 1343-4.

33. Shackleton, *op.cit.*, p.61. The author quotes the famous epigramme composed by Voltaire who had been Tournemine's pupil at the Collège Louis-le-Grand:

C'est notre Père Tournemine
Qui croit tout ce qu'il imagine .
34. Oeuvres complètes de Montesquieu, iii, 783.
35. See Simon, Fréret , p.19. Fréret was also accused of publishing 'plusieurs libelles contre la constitution' for the Jansenist party. He spent 6 months in the Bastille, from Dec. 1714 - June 1715.
36. Letter from Dubois to Du Bourg, Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 140, f.174.
37. Vienna, Staatsarchiv, Belgien, C:DD Abt B (Sonderreihe) 34; see also Max Braubach, Prinz Eugen von Savoyen, Munich, Oldenburg, 1963, v, 189ff.; unfortunately much of the material in the Staatsarchiv mentioned by Braubach appears to have been re-classified, and is extremely difficult to locate.
38. Letter 12 Mar. 1718: Staatsarchiv, B33 (old reference).
39. Lenglet attributes the Témoignage de la vérité to Fouillou, but in fact it was written by the Oratorian Vivien de la Borde; it was published in 1714 (n.p.).
40. This is the Hexaples, ou les six colonnes sur la constitution Unigenitus, Amsterdam, Kuiper, 1714-, 7 vols, in which many Jansenists collaborated under the direction of Fouillou and Quesnel (cf. Barbier, Dict.des anon., ii, 626).
41. Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 140, ff.338-9.
42. See Bibliography, 12.01.
43. Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 140, f.338.
44. This copy is in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Rés. 4° Ld¹⁰ 12^A, vol.i;)
45. Mémoires, p.153.
46. See Arch.Etr., Autriche 140, f.338, where Lenglet says that these two personages 'savent les difficultés que j'ai essuyées pour parvenir à faire paraître cette préface'.
47. See Appendix.
48. Op.cit., p.153.
49. See Nouvelles littéraires, i(1715), 147.
50. Année 1715, pp.616-20; there is a further notice of minor interest in the Journal littéraire, vi(1715), 239.

51. Journal des savants, 1715, p.620.
52. On this dispute see Edmond Preclin, Les Jansénistes du XVIIIe siècle et la constitution civile du clergé, Paris, Gamber, 1929, pp.88-90.
53. Nouv.acq.franç.3336, f.466-8.
54. At this time Noailles was still the leading voice in the opposition of the French clergy to Unigenitus.
55. The dedication to the Duc de Chartres was connected with one of Lenglet's many unsuccessful attempts to procure a church benefice through the Court (see Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 140, f.339). See Bibliography 13.01-13.09 for editions of the Méthode.
56. Cf. Michault, Mémoires, pp.81-2.
57. See the Nouvelles littéraires, vii(1718), 43: this is an anonymous defence of Lenglet's work which is undoubtedly from his own pen.
58. Ibid., pp.43-4.
59. See ibid., p.44, where these references are quoted.
60. See Mémoires, pp.88 ff.
61. Pp.462-83; again one must recall that Lenglet's friend Tournemine was director of the journal up to 1718. A much less favourable review of the 1736 ed. was to appear in the Mémoires in 1737 (pp.2002-27); this no doubt reflected a change in the direction of the journal at this time and is one example of the consistent hostility which the new editors showed towards Lenglet and his works(cf. below Chapter IV, pp.173-5, 227-9 et passim).
62. Vol. vi, 333-6.
63. The unsuitability of such a dedication was later pointed out in Desfontaines' Observations sur les écrits modernes, vii(1736), 235.
64. Nouvelles littéraires, vii(1718), 43-6.
65. I have not located any such copies.
66. Nouvelles littéraires, vii, 45.
67. Ibid., ix(1719), 322-9.
68. See, for example, the Trévoux critique of the 1736 ed. (1737, pp.2002-27), to which Lenglet replied with a brochure entitled Lettre de M. l'abbé Lenglet Du Fresnoy à l'auteur des 'Observations sur les écrits modernes', au sujet de la Méthode pour étudier la géographie (1739); and the Lettre amiable d'un Napolitain à M. l'Abbé Lenglet du Fresnoy, by Matteo Egittio, an Italian scholar who was librarian to the King of the two Sicilies (Paris, Barois fils, 1738, 120pp). Despite his reputation for

literary quarrels, on this occasion Lenglet did not take offence at the Neapolitan's corrections, and apparently wrote a polite reply, entitled Epître à Dom Matthéo Egittio (1742), of which I have not located any copies (see Bibliography, 35.01).

For further notices and 'compte-rendus' see the Journal des sçavants, 1717, pp.55-8, and pp.65-70; 1741, p.128; 1768, pp.202-5; Mémoires de Trévoux, 1736, p.2108; 1742, pp.1691-3; Bibliothèque française, xxv(1737), 182; Observations sur les écrits modernes, xxx(1742), 336; Mercure de France, Jan. 1768, p.136; Journal encyclopédique, Aug. 1768, pp.53-65.

69. For details of these events see Victor de Seilhac, L'Abbé Dubois, premier ministre de Louis XV, Paris, Amyot, 1862, ii, 37-45, and the note by Saint-Simon in the Journal du Marquis de Dangeau, xvii, 427 ff.
70. Delort, Détention des philosophes, pp.52, 57 and 65. Re Anne Bellinzani, Présidente Ferrand, see above Note 17.
71. The abbé Pucelle (1655-1745) was a hard-working magistrate of great integrity who entered the Parlement as a conseiller-clerc, was promoted to the grand chambre in 1702, and was nominated to the Conseil de Conscience by the Regent. He exerted a strong influence in the Parlement, where he remained active up to the end of his life. (Biog.univers., xxxiv, 499-500).
72. For an account of the du Maine intrigues see Pierre-Edouard Lemontey, Histoire de la Régence et de la minorité de Louis XV, Paris, Paulin, 1832, i, 204-5, and Henri Leclercq, Histoire de la Régence pendant la minorité de Louis XV, Paris, Champion, 1921, ii, 253.
73. This 'Mémoire' and other documents relating to this affair were published by Delort, op.cit., pp.45-72; they include the text of a police interrogation, in which Lenglet recounts the sequence of events in which he was involved (pp.52-3). I have not found the original manuscripts; they were apparently in Baron Pichon's private collection in 1880 (see Pichon, Vie de Charles-Henry Comte de Hoym, i, 18).
74. See Delort, op.cit., the 'Mémoire' on pp.50-1, and pp.54-5.
75. Ibid., p.45.
76. Ibid., P.55.
77. The Duc de Bourbon's comments are published alongside the text in ibid., pp.50-1.
78. Ibid., p.54.
79. There is a description in the Fichier Charavay (B.N., Dép. des manuscrits) of a letter in Lenglet's hand, dated 7 Sep. 1718, in which he speaks of the Cellamare conspiracy with the uncovering

of which he was subsequently involved. This could lend some weight to the supposition that Lenglet was working closely with Le Blanc and was put into the Bastille voluntarily as a 'mouton', but it is highly unlikely that such an elaborate charade would have been necessary to accomplish that purpose, or that the Présidente Ferrand would have taken part in it. It is much more likely that the Charavay catalogue mis-dated the letter, which was probably written in Sep. 1719. Many years later, in a 'Mémoire' on the subject of the Cellamare conspiracy (Mémoires de la régence, 1749, v, 169-209) Lenglet confesses to his part in the Ferrand affair. Praising the Regent for his lenient and forgiving nature, he adds: 'J'en suis moi même une preuve. De concert avec quelques membres du Parlement, j'avois tenté une démarche importante contraire à son autorité. Je lui fis un aveu sincere du tout: c'est ce qui le porta à l'oublier et même à me faire accorder les graces de Sa Majesté'.

80. See the Journal du Marquis de Dangeau, xvii, 396, and Swarte, Claude Le Blanc, pp.217-8.
81. Pichon, op.cit., i, 216.
82. Ibid., p.218.
83. Ibid., pp.213-4.
84. The 'ordre du Roi', countersigned Le Blanc, is in the Arch. de la Bastille, 10880, f.257; for the 'écrou' see Bastille, 12479, f.33, and 12482, f.84. Ravaisson gives 9 Dec. as the date of the 'ordre d'entrée', but this is clearly erroneous, as is the date he gives for Lenglet's release (Les Archives de la Bastille, xiii, 213). These erroneous dates gave rise to the assumption on the part of certain writers that Lenglet was imprisoned twice in 1718, the second time voluntarily. (See for example Brien, 'Lenglet Du Fresnoy, a biography', pp.462-3).
85. For details of the conspiracy see Lenglet's 'Réflexions sur la conspiration projetée par le Prince de Cellamare' in his edition of the Mémoires de la régence, v, 169-209; see also P. Labracherie and F. Millespieres, La conspiration de Cellamare, Paris, Del Duca, 1963, and Warren Hamilton Lewis, The sunset of the splendid century, the life and times of Louis Auguste de Bourbon, duc du Maine, 1670-1736, London, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1955.
86. See the 'Mémoire' presented to Malesherbes, Nouv.acq.franç.3344, f.50.
87. Saint-Simon suggests that Dubois wanted to attach the du Maine group to his interests by bonds of gratitude; they would, he hoped, provide a useful counter-balance to the Princes of the Blood in the event of the Regent's death. (Note in the Journal du Marquis de Dangeau, xvii, 432).
88. Lenglet recounted certain details of the affair to Jean-Baptiste

Rousseau: these are reported in a letter in the Arch.Etr., Corr. Pol., Autriche 140, f.98.

89. 'Réflexions...', p.208.
90. Ibid., pp.189-90.
91. See the 'ordre de sortie', dated 23 Dec. 1719, countersigned Le Blanc, in Bastille 10663, dossier 'Langlet'.
92. See B.N., Cabinet des Titres, Dossiers bleus 381, Langlet 10238, where the date is given erroneously as Dec. 1718, and Nouv.acq. franç.3344, f.50; also Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 140, f.339, where Lenglet describes his pension as being only a 'simple gratification du Roy, sans aucun Brevet'.
93. Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 140, f.100.
94. See Zeller, Les temps modernes, pp.175-6.
95. Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 140, f.100.
96. Cf. letter to Passionei, Vat.Lat.9813, ff.50-1.
97. See Louis Moréri, Le Grand dictionnaire historique, i, 7, and cf. Michault, Mémoires, p.198.
98. Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 140, f.311.
99. See Bibliography, 14.01. Jean Gay, Bibliographie des ouvrages relatifs à l'amour, aux femmes et au mariage gives c.1720 as the most likely date (i, 442). This edition has been widely attributed to Lenglet; in his edition of Régner (1733) he shows himself to be very familiar with the work, which led the Président Bouhier to link his name with it.
100. See below, Chapter IV, pp.181 ff.
101. See below, p.130.
102. Cf. Gay, op.cit., i, 443, and Pascal Pia, Les Livres de l'Enfer, Paris, Coulet et Faure, 1978, p.145.
103. Lettre d'un chanoine, pp.89-90.
104. The typographical features suggest such an origin; many bibliographies give Amsterdam as the place of publication.
105. Op.cit., i, 443.
106. Jean-Paul Bignon (1662-1743) was a nephew of the Chancelier Pontchartrain. A former Oratorian, he was a man of 'adventurous and inquiring mind', and was one of those academicians who used to meet in private with Boulainvilliers and the Duc de Noailles to indulge in freer discussion than was possible within the bounds of the academy. (See Gossman, Medievalism and the ideologies of the Enlightenment, pp.48 ff.).

107. See Biog.univers., iv, 302.
108. Journal littéraire, 1722, xii, 85. The anecdote occurs in a note in an article on Daniel Maichel's Introductio ad historiam literariam de praecipuis bibliothecis parisiensibus in which the journalist remarks that Maichel had been unable to comment on Bignon's library, since it was closed at the time when he wrote his book (it was published in 1721 in Canterbury).
109. See below, pp.137-8.
110. Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 140, f.122. Although there is a copy of the Inventory in the archives it is not clear which item listed might be the cassette referred to by Bignon.
111. Cf. Françoise Weil, Jean Bouhier et sa correspondance, Paris, Université de Paris-Sorbonne, 1975, i, p.xxxiii.
112. See, for example, his edition of the Journal de Henri III (1744), i, p.vii.
113. A substantial number of documents relating to Lenglet's arrest are preserved in the Archives des Affaires Etrangères, Correspondance Politique, Autriche 138-40. They include three lengthy pieces in Lenglet's hand which he wrote in reply to Cardinal Dubois' questions, and which give us a detailed (if incomplete) account of his life in Vienna, along with interesting information about the Imperial court and the entourage of Prince Eugene ('Questions faites à l'abbé Lenglet du fresnoy avec ses reponses', 140, ff.305-28; 'Premier Memoire', 140, ff.329-31; 'Second Memoire', 140, f.332-40). A small number of the letters were published by Ravaissou, Archives de la Bastille, xii, pp.95-100, though with a number of omissions and additions which indicate that he was working on copies of this correspondence located elsewhere. The 'Premier Memoire' was published by Manson Milner Brien in the article 'Nicolas Lenglet Du Fresnoy in the Low Countries, 1721', Papers of the Michigan Academy, xx(1935), 497-504, but with an unwarranted omission of two pages of manuscript. Max Braubach also exploited part of the material in his Prinz Eugen von Savoyen. Eine Biographie, Munich, Oldenburg, 1963, iv, 174-5; v, 187-93; and in Geschichte und Abenteuer, Gestalten um den Prinzen Eugen, Munich, Bruckmann, 1950, pp.354-88.
114. Autriche 140, f.305.
115. Ibid., f.306.
116. Ibid.
117. Ibid.
118. They included lettres de naturalité from the Emperor which Lenglet had been given in 1710 when he had hoped to get the canonicate at Tournai; they now needed to be updated (Autriche 140, ff.190, and 327-8).

119. Geschichte..., p.358.
120. See above, p.106.
121. See Braubach, Prinz Eugen, v, 189 and Note 300.
122. Détention des philosophes, p.72.
123. Re this affair see below, Chapter VI, pp.428 ff. The passage describing Lenglet's action is on pp.365-7 of volume iii (cancellanda).
124. Nouv.acq.franç.3344, f.54.
125. Ibid., ff.45-7, and f.51.
126. Ibid., f.51.
127. Ibid.
128. See Jean Carreyre, Le Jansénisme durant la Régence, Louvain, Bureau de la Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique, 1929-33, ii, p.122 ff.
129. Autriche 138, f.290; 140, f.41 etc.
130. See the account of his trip in the 'Premier Memoire', ff.329-31.
131. Autriche 140, ff.306-7.
132. 'Premier Memoire', ff.329-30. The Duchesse d'Arenberg's son Léopold, one of Eugene's generals, was later involved in Lenglet's quarrel with Rousseau: see below, Chapter IV, p.209.
133. Letter 18 Nov.1721, Jaupain to Eugene, Staatsarchiv, DD 136 bl/2.
134. See above, Chapter II, pp.63 ff.
135. Date given by Lenglet in his 'Second Memoire', f.332.
136. See letter J.-B. Rousseau to de Lasseré, 5 Dec. 1732, in Correspondance de Jean-Baptiste Rousseau et de Brossette, ii, 124.
137. See Dubourg to Dubois, 27 Dec. 1721, Autriche 138, ff.287-8.
138. Ibid.
139. See remark reported by J.-B. Rousseau to Dubourg, Autriche 140, ff.99-100.
140. Ibid., f.312. It was the Baron von Hohendorff, who was in Paris in 1713, who commissioned Etienne Boyet to go to Vienna on a large salary and look after the Prince's library. He remained there for over twenty years. (See Nicholas Henderson, Prince Eugene of Savoy, London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1964, p.262).
141. Lenglet mentions the interview briefly, giving the above date, in the 'Questions faites...', ff.307-8.

142. Letter to Cardinal Dubois, 27 Dec., Autriche 138, ff .287-8.
143. See the report given by Rousseau to Dubourg, recounted by the latter in the letter of 7 Mar. 1722, Autriche 140, ff.97-100; see also Rousseau's letter to de Lasseré in the Correspondance, pp.124-5, where the poet reverses, in retrospect, the order of events.
144. See uncensored copies of the Histoire de la monarchie française, iii, 366.
145. ii, 370-2 (cancellanda).
146. i, 70-2.
147. Autriche 140, f.41.
148. See Dubourg's letters in Autriche 138, f.287; 140, ff.72, 87, 92, and 95, which last letter contains the account of his conversation with Rousseau.
149. Autriche 140, f.99.
150. See Lenglet's detailed description of the way in which he spent his time in the 'Questions faites...', ff.307-15.
151. Ibid., f.314.
152. Autriche 140, ff.185-93.
153. Ibid., f.315; the materials for this study probably correspond to the documents referred to in the Inventory as 'vers gaulois' (ibid., f.190). Lenglet does not appear to have published any edition of these poets, though the mss. were found in an advanced state of preparation among his papers after his death. Michault in describing them says: 'Toutes ces Poésies, accompagnées de Notes Historiques et Critiques, devoient fournir deux volumes in-12. pour chacun des trois Poètes' (Mémoires, p.211-12). They may have been commissioned by the publisher Coustelier, who engaged other editors as a result of Lenglet's prolonged absence from Paris: see below, Chapter IV, pp.192-3.
154. Dubourg to Dubois, 21 Feb. 1722, Autriche 140, f.73.
155. See Autriche 140, f.198.
156. See 'Questions faites...', ff.323-4.
157. Dubourg to Dubois, 4 Mar. 1722, Autriche 140, f.92.
158. See Autriche 140, f.100. When Lenglet left, Garelli asked him to take a box of minerals which he wished to send to Jussieu, 'medecin du Roy et Professeur de Botanique au Jardin Royal des Plantes à Paris'; see the Inventory, ibid., f.185, and the 'Questions faites...', f.311.

159. See Dubourg's letter 7 Mar., Autriche 140, ff.97-100.
160. Lenglet's efforts to take revenge for this injury are discussed in Chapter IV, pp.206 ff.
161. See Dubourg to Dubois, 14 Mar. 1722, Autriche 140, f.115, and also ibid., ff.184, 198 and 332. Mlle Léronie is several times referred to as the painter's niece, though she was in fact his sister-in-law.
162. Dubourg to Dubois, 25 Mar. 1722, ibid., f.143.
163. Dubourg to Dubois, 11 Apr., ibid., f.156.
164. Inventaire, ibid., f.185.
165. Ibid.
166. 'Second Memoire', f.332.
167. Dubourg to Dubois, 25 Mar., Autriche 140, f.143.
168. See Correspondance, ii, 127. Other assertions made by Rousseau in the same letter are patently false: see below Chapter IV, p.207.
169. Letter 9 May 1722, Autriche 140, f.174. The Comte Dubourg should not be confused with the envoy in Vienna of the same name.
170. Dubourg to Dubois, 14 May, ibid., ff.178-80.
171. Ibid., f.180.
172. Ibid., f.182.
173. Ibid., f.179.
174. Ibid., ff.198-9.
175. Ibid., f.322.
176. Ibid., f.192. The Tables were not in fact published until 1729: see Bibliography, 17.01.
177. Ibid., ff.190-3.
178. See below, Chapter IV, pp.170 ff. and Appendix.
179. Letter 1 July 1722, Autriche 140, ff.243-4.
180. Ibid., f.245.
181. Lenglet to Dubois, 16 Sep., Autriche 141, f.120.
182. Dubourg to Dubois, 13 Jan. 1723, ibid., f.124.

183. Letter c. 16 Sep. 1722, ibid., f.120. Re Schaub see Pichon, Vie de Charles-Henry Comte de Hoym, i, 30-1.
184. Autriche 141, f.125.
185. Dubois to Dubourg, 10 Jan. 1723, Autriche 139, f.209.
186. Autriche 141, f.288.
187. Archives de la Bastille, xii, 98. The letter is dated 15 May 1722, but this is clearly a mistake on Ravaisson's part, as it refers to the affair of the library which had not been broached in the early stages of Lenglet's arrest.
188. Détention des philosophes, p.73; but Delort contradicts his information by giving the length of Lenglet's detention as six months, which is obviously incorrect.
189. iii, 368 (cancellandum).
190. Letter Lenglet to Passionei, 22 Apr. 1754, Vat.Lat.9813, f.15.
191. To recap: he cashed assets to the value of 1,000 florins (the florin was approx. equivalent to the livre) in Brussels in late 1721; Eugene paid him a sum possibly as large as 100 louis d'or (worth almost 2,400 livres); he must have spent significant additional sums on the initial trip from Paris to the Netherlands, and the return journey from Strasbourg to Paris after his release.
192. See Bibliography, 15.01 ff.
193. Barbier bases his attribution on the Soleinne catalogue (Dict.des anon., iv, 595).
194. Supplément (ed. 15.01), p.4.
195. Cf. above, Chapter I, p.8.
196. See Chapter I, p.10.
197. Duc de Saint Simon, Mémoires, Paris, Gallimard (Pléiade), 1961, vii, 255; quoted in Swarte, Claude Le Blanc, p.195.
198. Swarte, op.cit., p.202.
199. Marais, Journal et mémoires, ii, 316.
200. Swarte, op.cit., pp.193-4.
201. See Marais, op.cit., ii, 473-4, and Saint-Simon, op.cit., vii, 257. (Swarte, op.cit., p.198).
202. Marais, op.cit., ii, 412.
203. Ibid., p.428.

204. Swarte, op.cit., p.203.
205. See the 'écrou', Bastille 12479, f.61, and Swarte, op.cit., p.206.
206. See Marais, op.cit., ii, 474 (Swarte, op.cit., p.201).
207. Ibid.
208. See Frantz Funck-Brentano, Les Lettres de cachet à Paris, Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1903, p.209.
209. Pierre Narbonne, Journal des règnes de Louis XIV et Louis XV, Paris, Durand et Lauriel, 1866 (quoted by Swarte, op.cit., p.209).
210. See Funck-Brentano, op.cit., p.210.
211. Marais, op.cit., iii, 143 (Swarte, op.cit., pp.218-9). There is no date mentioned for the affair.
212. Ibid., p.144 (Swarte, op.cit., p.219).
213. Ibid., p.140 (Swarte, op.cit., pp.212-13).
214. See record of de la Barre's entry to Vincennes in Franç. 14061, f.50; he was transferred to the Conciergerie on the 28 July 1724 (ibid., f.49). Du Chevron was transferred to the Bastille in June 1725 (Bastille 12479, f.72).
215. See Bastille 12479, f.62, and 12482, f.268.
216. See record of his entry to the Donjon on 25 Mar. in Franç. 14061, f.51, and also Franç. 7646, f.201; the order for his arrest is given in Delort, Détention des philosophes, p.74. See, however, his account of this 'voyage' in the Preface to De l'Usage des romans, vol. 1, where he states he was 'embarqué le 24 Mars 1724. tème triste.'
217. See Funck-Brentano, op.cit., p.188.
218. Marais, op.cit., iii, 569-70. Arnaud de Bouëx, who was first a Conseiller au Parlement and later a Maître des Requêtes, used the Le Blanc affair to curry favour with the Duc de Bourbon, principally by means of various libelles which he got the abbé Margon to write against the Minister to whom he had formerly been attached. He also succeeded in arousing suspicion against Hérault, Lieutenant général de police, whose position he coveted, and was thus given the right to interrogate prisoners in the Bastille. He was the Lenglet family's bête noire, as will be seen below. Guillaume Plantavit de la Pause, abbé de Margon, who came from an old noble family, is generally described by biographers as an 'homme d'un caractère atroce'; he had been employed by Le Blanc as a spy and as a librarian, a combination which we have seen was not unique, but had then turned to spying against him for Breteuil and the Duc de Bourbon. His satires on public figures finally led

to his being exiled to the Lérins Islands in 1743. (Cf. Biog. univers., xxvi, 542-3, and the notes on Margon and de Bouëx in Nouv.acq.franç. 1891, ff.147-50.

219. Funck-Brentano, op.cit., pp.209-10; the original 'Mémoire' does not appear to have been conserved in the Archives de la Bastille.
220. See Marais, op.cit., iii, 103 (Swarte, op.cit., p.207).
221. See Funck-Brentano, op.cit., p.209.
222. Margon is a good case in point. Cf. Villars' remark about the attitude of the Parlement towards Le Blanc quoted on p.147 below.
223. Claude-Louis-Hector, duc de Villars, Mémoires, Paris, Renouard, 1884-1904, iv, 288 (Swarte, op.cit., p.204).
224. See letter from Le Blanc to the government, 17 Apr. 1709, in which he suggested that it might be necessary to have Jaupain captured, and force him to reveal information; he added: 'si l'on faisoit une pareille entreprise il faudroit que jaupain n'en pust pas revenir, et rendre compte de ce qui se seroit passé.' (Arch. de la Guerre, A 2155, no.64).
225. Swarte, op.cit., p.211, Note 1, quoted from Saint-Simon, Ecrits inédits, ed. P. Feugère, Paris, Hachette, 1883, vol. vi.
226. Ibid.
227. See Swarte, op.cit., pp.211-2.
228. Villars, Mémoires, iv, 305-6 (Swarte, op.cit., pp.220-1).
229. Cf. Funck-Brentano, op.cit., p.210.
230. Swarte, op.cit., p.222.
231. Ibid., p.223; there is no indication of the date on which Le Blanc was transferred from the Bastille to Vincennes.
232. Ravaisson, Archives de la Bastille, xiii, 411.
233. iii, pp.370-1.
234. Ms. letter from De Longuemarre to Déon de Beaumont, 25 Apr. 1755, in the 'Collection des papiers de famille du Chevalier d'Eon', Bibliothèque de Tonnerre, Tome V.
235. See the 'écrou' in Bastille 12479, f.72, and 12482, f.318; and the record of his leaving Vincennes in Franç. 14061, f.50, and Franç. 7647, ff.42 and 44.
236. See the 'ordre du 26e de Juillet 1725', Bastille 10887, f.316.
237. Cf. 'ordre du 8e de mars 1725', Franç. 7647, f.4.

238. The letter is conserved in the dossier marked de la Barre, Bastille 10801. Lenglet remarks that there are seven or eight of them - 'les malheureux de cette affaire' - left in prison.
239. By a strange irony, Arnaud's dark dealings were finally uncovered through an examination of Margon's papers, and he was exiled to Angoulême on 25 Feb. 1726, just two weeks after Lenglet wrote this letter (see *Nouv.acq.franç.*, ff.147-50).
240. Delort, Détention des philosophes, pp.75-6.
241. See Theodore Besterman, Voltaire, London, Longman, 1970, pp.106-7.
242. A letter from Lenglet to Voltaire was sold in a Charavay sale in 1885 (cf. Voltaire's Correspondance, ed. Theodore Besterman, D.298). The sale catalogue states: 'Belle lettre écrite huit jours après la sortie de Voltaire [sic. for Lenglet?] de la Bastille, où ils étaient ensemble. Il le remercie des démarches qu'il a bien voulu faire pour son élargissement, et il n'oubliera jamais que c'est grâce à lui qu'il l'a obtenu' (see Fichier Charavay, B.N., Département des ms.). The date given in the catalogue, '19 juin (1718)', is erroneous, as Lenglet did not enter the Bastille until September of that year. The letter undoubtedly dates from this 1724-6 imprisonment: Lenglet was released on 25 June of the latter year, and the most likely date for the letter is therefore 29 June 1726. Although Lenglet was undoubtedly aware that his release was due principally to Le Blanc's return to power, this did not detract from the gratitude he felt for Voltaire's interest and efforts on his behalf.
243. The date is given as 25 June in Bastille 12550, f.96, and 10880, f.252, though Delort (*op.cit.*, p.76) quotes the 'ordre du Roi' as dated 26 June.
244. Cf. Lenglet, Histoire de la monarchie française, iii, 371.
245. Cf. note in Bastille 12479, f.40.
246. See Swarte, Claude Le Blanc, p.227.
247. 19 May 1728 (Swarte, *op.cit.*, p.233).
248. Cf. for example the preface to De l'Usage des romans, where Lenglet uses his customary euphemism of the 'voyage' for his imprisonment: 'Un Voyage de long cours...m'ayant procuré quelques mois de loisir, je me suis appliqué à diverses choses; mais sur-tout à cet Ouvrage'.

CHAPTER IV

1729-1739The abbé as writer: studies in historical methodology

Lenglet's two central interests in history and in the French poets of previous centuries, manifested in his preoccupations during his stay in Vienna,¹ are brought to fruition in the publications of the following decade. The first major achievement of this extremely prolific period was the new edition of the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire which he had been contemplating for fifteen years.² Early in 1728 appeared a Prospectus³ offering for subscription a greatly augmented Méthode in three quarto volumes, to be published by 'la veuve d'Antoine-Urbain Coustelier' and Pierre Gandouin, to whom she had conceded a third of her privilège. Lenglet announced that he had enriched the original Méthode with an abridged history of the ancient and modern nations, in addition to correcting numerous errors in the first edition which had since been brought to his attention; he stated that the 'Catalogue des principaux historiens' would contain the additions and corrections made by those who had edited the work in other countries, along with a large amount of material which he had collected himself. The publishers promised to have the work ready for delivery by the following November to those who would subscribe thirty livres: non-subscribers would eventually have to pay forty-five livres. A further subscription was proposed for four large copper-engraved Tables chronologiques de l'histoire universelle, of which the first two, devoted to the ancient monarchies, would show clearly the various systems of chronology in

parallel - 'ce qui n'avoit pas encore été tenté jusqu'ici'; subscribers could acquire these tables for half the price at which they would subsequently be sold.

In April 1728 the Veuve Coustelier inserted a notice in the Journal des savants⁴ to inform the public that there would be no duodecimo issue of the new edition, as the chronological tables with their several columns of figures would preclude the work's being printed in a small format: her intention was obviously to urge people to subscribe for the quarto edition, and the action suggests that the initial response from the public may not have been satisfactory. The publication was soon to run into trouble from several quarters. The administration had, apparently, decided to curb the practice of subscriptions, and Lenglet and his publishers had circulated their Prospectus without prior permission.⁵ Secondly, the work ran foul of the censorship authorities: the examiner appointed, Claude Gros de Boze, Secretary of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-lettres,⁶ ordered innumerable changes and excisions, some running to several pages in length, and necessitating the printing of an inordinate number of cancellantia to replace the offending material.⁷ These combined circumstances held up publication for six months, and probably at one point appeared insurmountable, for the Veuve Coustelier withdrew from the enterprise in January 1729 leaving it totally in the hands of Gandouin.⁸

Lenglet owed the resolution of at least the former problem to an association he had formed with the Marquis de Santa-Cruz de Marzenado, plenipotentiary of the king of Spain at the peace congress held in Soissons from June 1728 to July 1729 between Spain, England and the

Empire.⁹ Lenglet was present at the congress: whether he was sent in an official capacity, or simply turned up looking for work, is unclear, but he does appear to have been taken into the Marquis' service at some time during the negotiations.¹⁰ The meeting was most opportune for the abbé who evidently invoked the ambassador's intercession with the authorities on the question of the illegal subscriptions. Lenglet describes the sequence of events in dedicating his new edition to the Marquis, and incidentally casts some light on the situation with regard to subscriptions at this time:

Dès que [Votre Excellence] eut appris que je lui avois donné une nouvelle forme, Elle a bien voulu s'en déclarer le protecteur: Elle ne s'est pas contentée de me faire connoître avec bonté les imperfections qu'Elle y avoit remarquées, Elle a encore sollicité auprès des Magistrats Superieurs les permissions nécessaires, pour engager le public à entrer prématurément dans les dépenses qu'il falloit faire, pour donner à cet Ouvrages une forme convenable. Ces difficultez se sont trouvées plus considerables que je ne l'avois crû d'abord. Elles étoient occasionées par la mauvaise foi de beaucoup de Libraires, qui avoient abusé de la confiance des Souscriptions, pour surprendre la facilité des curieux, et des gens de lettres. Les Magistrats avoient raison de mettre fin à ce nouveau brigandage. Et sans les sollicitations vives et réitérées de Votre Excellence, on auroit peut-être fait porter aux innocens la peine qu'on devoit imposer aux coupables. Elle a bien voulu, en prenant ce Livre sous sa protection, promettre qu'il seroit ponctuellement délivré au public. Et comme je crois avoir satisfait non seulement aux engagements que Votre Excellence avoit pris, mais que j'ai fait encore plus que je n'avois promis, je me crois obligé de faire connoître l'obligation que le public vous a, d'avoir franchi en sa faveur et en faveur des lettres, des difficultez qui auroient été insurmontables à tout autre, qu'à un Seigneur, qui aime souverainement le bien public, et qui sçait faire connoître à ses amis l'activité de son zele et de son amitié. ¹¹

The additions which Lenglet had made to his original edition were of major significance, both in quantity and content, particularly the chronological account of ancient history. For this Lenglet drew his material from a number of unorthodox sources, and most especially from a manuscript work by the Comte Henri de Boulainvilliers: the Comte, as we have seen, was the central figure in a group of scholars who pursued

their independent researches in a private 'academy', removed from the vigilant eye of the royal authority. Sometime around 1700 Boulainvilliers composed an Abrégé d'histoire universelle for the use of his sons,¹² with the unavowed motive, Paul Vernière assures us, of rivalling Bossuet whose famous treatise he severely condemned.¹³ Since the work was not destined for publication Boulainvilliers could give free rein to his rigorous, strikingly honest mind;¹⁴ deeply influenced by his readings of Spinoza, he wished to re-examine his material in a resolutely critical perspective.¹⁵ His avowed intention was to confront and hopefully reconcile ancient history with the laws of physics:

Je tacheray de concilier les miracles même ceux de la création et du déluge avec les idées que nous donne la Philosophie naturelle persuadé que c'est ayder la vérité le plus seür moyen d'éloigner les douttes et les inquiétudes non que je ne reconnoisse les avantages de la parfaite soumission telle que nostre religion l'exige, mais parceque je sçais q. tous les hommes n'en sont pas capables.¹⁶

Boulainvilliers' text, composed of sections of narrative followed by sections of analysis, was extremely thorough and detailed; one large volume was devoted to Jewish and Egyptian history, and of course concentrated especially on the Book of Genesis; a second volume dealt with the history of Greece and Rome. Despite its great length, which must have made it extremely expensive to have copied, and unwieldy for circulating, we know that many copies were in fact made, and sold on the clandestine market.¹⁷ Lenglet had access to one of these manuscripts, and apparently copied out lengthy passages for his own use: we have seen that on his return from Vienna in 1722 he had among his papers 'Plusieurs cahiers de remarques sur l'histoire d'Egypte et autres pièces antiques, et curieuses',¹⁸ which may well have been extracts from the Abrégé d'histoire universelle. Lenglet's account of ancient history in the new Méthode followed that of Boulainvilliers so closely that it was in fact a massive and unavowed plagiarisation; it

was only in 1772 that M. Drouet, the new editor of the Méthode, revealed the extent of Lenglet's debt to the Comte:

L'Abbé Lenglet, qui savait très bien priser les choses, et qui n'étoit pas trop délicat sur les procédés, s'appropriâ [l'Abrégé] et en inséra une partie dans les dernières éditions de Sa Méthode d'Histoire. L'article de la Dispersion des peuples, le commencement de l'Histoire sainte, et la plus grande partie de ce qu'il dit sur l'Histoire d'Egypte, en sont tirés. Il avoit même, en parlant de la création, du déluge, etc. copié trop crûment certains endroits, qui occasionnerent la plupart des cartons qu'on l'obligea de faire [...]. Enhardi par le succès, l'abbé Lenglet y puisa encore l'Histoire des Patriarches, l'Histoire Grecque et l'Histoire des Colonies des Phéniciens le long des côtes de la Mer Méditerranée et de l'Océan. C'étoit de l'ouvrage tout fait: il inséra ces morceaux dans son Supplément, dont ils forment les Discours X, XI, XII, XIII, XIV, XV, XVI, et XVII. Au moyen de cela, l'Ouvrage de M. le comte de Boulainvilliers se trouve inséré tout entier dans celui de l'abbé Lenglet, à l'exception de quelques réflexions hardies, téméraires même [...].

Though Drouet was correct in asserting that much of the material had been copied word for word from the Abrégé, especially in Lenglet's Supplément of 1739, nonetheless a significant proportion of Boulainvilliers' text was adapted by the abbé to suit the purposes of his 1729 edition. The complexity of the relationship between Boulainvilliers' text and Lenglet's renderings of it has been highlighted in an article by J.-P. Kaminker;²⁰ sometimes the abbé abridges or summarises lengthy developments by Boulainvilliers, sometimes he adapts and changes the Comte's arguments, even to the point of entirely deforming their original direction. Often, though not always, Lenglet's modifications were motivated by prudence, since he needed to acquire the censor's approval for the work. Lenglet compensates for this compromise by a heavy use of irony, and he frequently adopts the technique of presenting his ideas as quotations from other authors (unnamed like Boulainvilliers), from which he can dissociate himself; his tone is in marked contrast to Boulainvilliers' work which is outstanding for the seriousness and intellectual honesty stamped on every page.

The Boulainvilliers material accounted in part for the problems which arose vis-à-vis the censorship authorities. The changes which the censor ordered were however wide-ranging, and affected all four volumes; but the libraire, though he lost a great deal of time in reprinting the cartons, certainly recouped his losses by selling the original excised pages clandestinely.²¹ We get an amusing indication of Lenglet's own pride in the censored material from the remarks of a certain Charles-Etienne Jordan who published an account of a visit to the abbé in 1733. When the subject of the Méthode arose, he was quick to regale the visitors with an example of his abilities:

Cet Abbé nous lut plusieurs des Endroits supprimez. A la vérité, il paroît que l'illustre Censeur a eu bien raison de les retrancher.²²

Lenglet was a good reader, and often entertained his friends in similar fashion.

The edition was finally distributed in May 1729: several journals noted the fact,²³ but it was some time before any serious critique was published. However, November of that year saw the appearance of an anonymous 'Mémoire adressé aux Auteurs des Mémoires de Trévoux', attacking Lenglet on many heads:²⁴ his own 'méthode', the writer argues, is non-existent, and his reasoning on the subject extremely woolly. But far more seriously, he is attacked for his impious treatment of the supernatural, and biblical accounts of miracles: he consistently attempts, it is asserted, to suggest 'natural' causes for miraculous events, such as the deluge, the burning of Sodom, the parting of the Red Sea etc., which are, we are reminded, articles of faith for any good Catholic. If such are the published ideas of the abbé Lenglet, what horrors, the author asks himself, must have been contained in the hundreds of excised pages? He adds:

Pour faire exacte justice à l'Ouvrage, il faudroit à peu près autant de cartons que de feuillets.²⁵

Lenglet's sections on geography, chronology and bibliography are also severely attacked on grounds of inaccuracy, and unsound judgement.

A justification of Lenglet on a minor point of fact appeared in the Mémoires de Trévoux in January 1730,²⁶ but it was not until October of that year that Lenglet finally succeeded in having the Jesuits print a reply of his own. He had written two previous 'Mémoires apologétiques' to the authors of the journal, insisting that they were themselves responsible for the grave calumnies against his character and orthodoxy as a Catholic priest; not surprisingly the Jesuits refused to publish them, and Lenglet then threatened them with judicial action.²⁷ They finally accepted the third 'Mémoire', on condition that the attack be addressed to the 'auteur anonyme', rather than the Père Hongnant, director of the journal, as was Lenglet's original intention.²⁸ Lenglet declares himself to be outraged by the serious accusations made against him:

C'est un Théologien Catholique, que l'on accuse à tort, non seulement d'errer sur la Foi, mais même de favoriser les libertins et les incrédules. Ainsi, M.R.P. il faut que lui ou moi soyons condamnés, il faut que lui ou moi donnions un désaveu formel.²⁹

He refutes his accuser by holding fast to the letter of his text, in which he had taken care to reject the reasoning of Josephus and other 'infidel' historians, after quoting them at length: the reproaches are a misconstruction of his intentions, he claims, and were made in bad faith. Lenglet's argument could not have sounded very convincing to anyone who had seen the excised passages, the implications of which were patently clear.

But the Jesuits were far from ready to bow to Lenglet's high tone, or concede that he had been wrongfully blamed in the original offending

article. On the contrary, in May 1731 the authors of the Mémoires took it upon themselves to answer Lenglet's apology in a two-part article, unrelenting in its analysis of the abbé's treatment of miracles:³⁰ he is squarely condemned for undermining the supernatural dimension of the biblical stories, and is accused in scarcely veiled terms of being an 'incrédule':

Tel est à vôtre avis le sentiment des Critiques incroyables; or tel est proprement le sentiment que vous saisissez pour le vôtre: vous en appropriés vous-même les termes.³¹

The authors do not fail to point to the inconsistency between the orthodox remarks to be found in one of the cartons and the implications of the surrounding text.³² These accusations are further qualified in the second article by the epithet 'spinosiste'; the authors attack Lenglet for his evident approbation of Thomas Burnet's rationalistic explanation of the Deluge in terms of physical law:

Vous dites, 'que les Loix naturelles et l'Ordre de Dieu ne sont en effet qu'une même chose considérée sous différens égards',³³ mais loin que cette remarque puisse être une modification qui amène le sentiment de Th. Burnet à la Religion, faudroit-il changer quelque chose dans ce discours pour qu'il parût suggéré par Spinoza? Et couteroit-il beaucoup à un Athée qui donne à la Nature le nom de Dieu, de dire, 'que les Loix naturelles et l'Ordre de Dieu ne sont en effet qu'une même chose considérée sous differens égards'? Si le Spinosiste vouloit faire sentir dans une Exposition du Déluge tout son Athéisme, pourroit-il mieux réduire l'Ordre de Dieu aux Loix naturelles, qu'en empruntant tous les termes de vôtre modification.³⁴

These were serious charges indeed, and seem to have effectively silenced Lenglet who would not have wanted such remarks brought to the attention of the Parlement. He did however bear a deep and lasting grudge against the Jesuits on this account.

Other journalists were kinder to him; the critic in the Journal des savants, in May 1730,³⁵ pointed out that the journal did not normally give detailed extracts of second editions, but they were making an

exception on this occasion because 'Il y a dans cette nouvelle Edition des augmentations si considerables, qu'on peut en quelque maniere considerer cette Méthode pour étudier l'Histoire comme un Ouvrage nouveau.' The résumé is largely neutral in tone; the reviewer makes some mildly approbatory remarks on certain aspects of the edition, such as the 'Canons chronologiques' which he says merit particular attention, but he is, on the other hand, obviously critical of Lenglet's sarcasms in the 'Catalogue' at the expense of other writers such as the Père Daniel. Surprisingly, no critic pointed to the vast plagiarisations from Boulainvilliers' Abrégé.

Other complaints were made against Lenglet on grounds such as those quoted by J.-B. Michault: 'On se plaignit amèrement de ses jugemens souvent précipités, quelquefois très-mal fondés, et presque toujours caustiques'.³⁶ Bonardy, for example, writing to the Président Bouhier in March 1729 was far from approbatory:

Cet abbé promet de nous donner un semblable ouvrage sur les belles lettres. Il pourra bien y avoir autan et plus de fautes que dans l'autre [la Méthode], parce qu'il ne mettra sans doute pas plus de temps à le perfectionner. Mais pourvu que les sujets interessent, et qu'il y ait quelque chose de hardi, comme dans tout ce qui sort de sa plume, les exemplaires ne pourrissent pas chez le Libraire.³⁷

Nonetheless, Michault's final judgement was a positive one:

Malgré tout cela, cet Ouvrage passe pour un bon Livre, et même pour un très-bon Livre. Car on peut être habile homme et mauvais Juge, comme l'Abbé Lenglet le remarque fort bien lui-même.³⁸

Gandouin evidently had no cause to regret his decision to publish the work, for he was ready to republish (in censored form) in 1735, in both 4° and 12° editions.³⁹ In the 'Avertissement du libraire' he was at pains to point out that the 4° edition was being issued only on a small size of paper, and that the contents were unchanged,⁴⁰ so that those who had bought the 1729 edition, all copies of which had been

printed on large sized paper, would not feel cheated; an assertion which was not altogether true as Lenglet had in fact made a number of changes. This edition was in turn copied in Amsterdam, without the 'Catalogue des historiens', in 1737.⁴¹

Already in 1735 Lenglet was planning a Supplément, which could be printed simultaneously in all three formats;⁴² this was finally published in 1740.⁴³ It contained a number of additional 'Discours' on methodology, with some repetition from the original Méthode; other chapters added detail on areas already dealt with summarily, and there were thirteen 'Discours' devoted to contemporary European states. In the chapters relating to ancient history we have seen that Lenglet managed to insert a large amount of additional material directly plagiarised from Boulainvilliers, some of which he had been obliged to abridge or adapt in the 1729 edition:⁴⁴ it is interesting to note the assumption on his part that the censorship would be more lax than on the previous occasion, an assumption justified in the event by the approbation.⁴⁵

The 'Catalogue des historiens' included works which had been overlooked in previous editions, and additional commentaries by Lenglet, as well as lists of new books published since the last edition of the Méthode. The critics again revelled in pointing out Lenglet's by now famous 'bévues', and other equally familiar traits. The Bibliothèque française comments:

On y parle de Livres qui n'ont jamais existé, et on y fait dire à des Auteurs ce qu'ils n'ont jamais dit... On dirait que l'Auteur n'a jamais ouvert les Livres dont il parle,⁴⁵

while the abbé Desfontaines in the Observations sur les écrits modernes adds:

Le Catalogue des Historiens offre beaucoup d'anecdotes curieuses, et divers traits ironiques et badins, propres à chatouiller la malignité du Lecteur. On sait que M. Lenglet aime à s'égaier lorsqu'il en trouve l'occasion.⁴⁷

But the success of the Méthode was already consecrated, and the Supplément was sure to sell well, as is indicated in a subsequent article by the same journalist:

Du reste ce Supplément mérite un accueil aussi favorable du public, que celui qu'en a reçu la Méthode même.⁴⁸

That the Méthode remained an enduring favourite up to the end of the century is testified by the fact that 42% of the thousand-copy revised edition, published by De Bure in 1772 in fifteen duodecimo volumes, had already been sold by 1777.⁴⁹

Simultaneously with the 1729 Méthode Lenglet published the Tables chronologiques on which he had been working in Vienna as far back as 1721, and which were intended to complement the Méthode;⁵⁰ these consisted of four large folio engraved tables, in which the various systems of chronology were presented in parallel columns and could be easily related to each other; they also included Lenglet's 'observations' on chronology, but were principally intended as wall-charts for reference purposes. They were republished in 1733 and 1767.⁵¹

Lenglet's relations with the Marquis de Santa-Cruz boded well for him over this period. The Marquis had undertaken to publish an Histoire de tous les traités faits par les rois d'Espagne depuis Ferdinand le Catholique,⁵² and to that end he procured copies of all the acts deposited in the archives of Simancas: he engaged Lenglet to assist him in this project. The latter gives the following account of their collaboration in his Europe pacifiée:

Je fus Commis il y a environ 20 ans, avec une personne distinguée, pour rédiger le Corps Diplomatique de la Couronne d'Espagne avec les autres puissances de l'Europe. Nous ne commençons qu'au règne des Rois Ferdinand et Isabelle et nous devions venir jusques à ces derniers temps. J'avais dans mon partage, les Règnes de Ferdinand le Catholique, Philippe III et Charles II et mon ami avait ceux de Philippe I, Charles I et Philippe II, Philippe IV et de Philippe V. On me remit les pièces des Règnes, dont j'étais chargé [...] La mort de mon associé m'engagea à renvoyer en Espagne tous les titres, qui étaient en ma possession. Ils étaient tous tirés des Archives de Simanacas, et certifiés véritables par le Gardien du Trésor des Chartres de cette Couronne.⁵³

Unfortunately, as Lenglet indicates, he did not have long to benefit from the Marquis' patronage, for the latter was killed by the Moors in North Africa in 1732. The work they were preparing together was never published.⁵⁴ Lenglet had, however, been commissioned at the end of 1729 to prepare a pamphlet announcing the public festival offered by the King of Spain on the birth of the Dauphin; it appeared under the title Description de la feste et du feu d'artifice qui doit être tiré à Paris, sur la rivière, au sujet de la naissance de Monseigneur le Dauphin, par ordre de Sa Majesté Catholique Philippe V. Et par les soins de Leurs Excellences M. le Marquis de Santa-Cruz et M. de Barrenechea, Ambassadeurs Extraordinaires, et Plenipotentiaires du Roy d'Espagne. Le XXI. Janvier M.DCC.XXX.⁵⁵ This was a sumptuous 4° brochure, with three large engravings depicting the tableaux planned for the occasion. Lenglet published a further brochure in a much simplified form when the date was changed to 24th January.⁵⁶ It is likely that he performed other such services for Santa-Cruz, of which we have now no trace, and which would have provided him with a basic income; he had good reason to regret the Marquis' premature death.

Lenglet's publishing activities continued to diversify, and the year 1731 saw no fewer than five heterogeneous works with Lenglet's mark through the presses. One was reminiscent of his earliest editorial

efforts: this was a new edition of the Imitation de Jésus-Christ.⁵⁷ It was based, Lenglet claimed, on a number of early French editions which he had discovered, entitled De l'Internelle consolation, and which, he argued, would appear to be the original text, probably written in French by Gerson, and only later translated into Latin by Thomas a'Kempis, to whom it was commonly attributed.⁵⁸ He bases his argument on internal stylistic features: he can see no evidence in the French text to suggest its being a translation, and it is directed towards a wider public than the Latin version which addresses itself particularly to those in religious orders.⁵⁹ These French editions also contained an additional chapter, omitted in recent editions, and which Lenglet has chosen to include in his. A.-A. Barbier, however, in his Dissertation sur soixante traductions françaises de l'Imitation de Jésus-Christ, points to the 'ressemblance très-frappante entre cette traduction et celle de Saci. Notre abbé s'est contenté de faire quelques changemens à celle-ci pour avoir droit de la publier sous son nom'.⁶⁰ Barbier does however support Lenglet's attribution to Gerson, and expresses surprise that the abbé never replied to an article attacking his views, entitled 'Lettre d'un religieux bénédictin de la Congrégation de St. Maur écrite à M. de Laroque, au sujet de l'Avertissement de M. l'abbé Lenglet du Fresnoi, sur l'excellence et l'auteur du livre de l'Imitation de Jésus-Christ', and published in the Mercure in 1742.⁶¹ The 'bénédictin' points out that the earliest known manuscripts are in Latin, and shows up a number of inconsequences in Lenglet's argument. For once, however, the abbé failed to pick up the glove.

Barbier in his article also felt it was highly unlikely that Lenglet should have published two translations of the De l'Imitation, firstly, 'en formes de prières' in 1700, and again in 1731,⁶² but he himself

had already indicated how little effort Lenglet had put into this second version; the abbé was obviously aware that this was a work of enduring popularity, which would find an audience in its several forms, and was part of the basic stock of many booksellers.⁶³ Indeed, shortly before his death he was planning to produce a new Latin edition in quarto format.⁶⁴ The edition of 1731 was itself reedited a number of times.⁶⁵

Like three of Lenglet's other publications in this year, the Imitation was published abroad (in Antwerp) and therefore needed no approbation or privilège : the fifth, La Catanoise, had already been passed by the censor in 1728.⁶⁶ One wonders if Lenglet was out of favour with the French administration for some offence, and therefore hesitated to apply for any authorisations whatsoever, or whether he was pushed to turn his attention to Holland and the Netherlands by a hope of favourable terms from the libraires there, coupled with the desire to publish works which he knew would not be tolerated by the authorities in France. There is, in fact, evidence to suggest that he actually visited Holland late in 1730 or early in 1731; a letter from the Hague to J.-B. Rousseau on the subject of our abbé, dated March 1731, contains the remark 'Il n'est plus dans ce pays'.⁶⁷ It was presumably at this time that he negotiated with the booksellers the whole series of editions which were to appear outside France over the next couple of years.

Discoveries in early French poetry

That Lenglet had a taste for the Belles-lettres, and particularly for works in a libertin vein, we gathered from his anonymous edition of Le Cabinet satyrique. In these middle years of his life, as his hopes

of a respectable position in the church grow weaker, he gives free rein to his interest in the literature which had been officially scorned during the 'siècle d'or' of Louis XIV. His editions of medieval and sixteenth-century French poets figure large amid the activities of this period. We have already seen that as early as 1721 Lenglet was working on the 'premiers poètes de notre langue Villon, Pathelin, Cocquillart';⁶⁸ this interest in the French poets parallels his interest in French history, and places him squarely in the camp of the modernes.⁶⁹ It was only in the latter part of this decade that the growing interest in the French cultural past was clearly articulated at the Académie des Inscriptions, which is largely credited with the revival of interest in medieval studies:⁷⁰ in 1727 Camille Falconet read a paper which invited the scholars to participate in a programme of research into the national past. Among the areas he evoked, and which had been neglected by the scholars of the seventeenth century, was the history of French literature.⁷¹ Likewise Lacurne de Sainte-Palaye, one of the foremost medievalists, lamented that 'Nos vieilles Chroniques, nos anciens Poètes n'ont pas encore acquis auprès d'un certain ordre d'Erudits la considération que donne l'avantage d'être au monde depuis trois mille ans'.⁷² The extent to which tastes were changing among the general reading public in the course of the century was indicated by Daniel Mornet's research into private libraries: he showed that the number of eighteenth-century reeditions of works of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries figuring in these collections was significant. Three of the works of which he makes special mention are precisely those which Lenglet chose to reedit.⁷³ In this instance one can again see Lenglet's flair for responding to evolving tastes within the reading public. His standpoint was, of course, different from that of the academicians: for

many of these, nobles of the robe and sword, the interest in medievalism and sixteenth-century literature represented a conscious political choice, and was an expression of their distaste for the absolutism of Louis XIV;⁷⁴ alternately, to quote Lionel Gossman:

[Others] used the language and the arguments of the early Enlighteners [...] and they wrote of the past not from the point of view of some standard in the past - be it that of the nobility, that of the robe, or that of the Christian community - but from the point of view of an enlightened and sophisticated society, a strange amalgam of aristocracy and bourgeoisie, which felt its modernity and no longer identified itself completely with any age or social group in the past.⁷⁵

Lenglet's interest in the earlier literature cannot be identified clearly with either of the above groups; it is more an expression of that anarchic spirit which led him to oppose all accepted norms of political and social life, even on the linguistic and literary planes: in many ways he seems to have wished to identify himself rather with the libertin tradition of the 17th century than with any contemporary movement of ideas, which is not surprising when one recalls that he was born in 1674 into a potentially free-thinking provincial milieu.

J.-B. Michault said of him:

Toutes ses études étoient tournées du côté des siècles passés; il en affectoit jusqu'au langage Gothique; faisant peu de cas des Auteurs modernes. Je veux, disoit-il, être Franc-Gaulois dans mon style comme dans mes actions. Aussi seroit-on quelquefois tenté de le prendre pour un Sçavant du seizième siècle, plutôt que pour un Littérateur du dix-huitième.⁷⁶

This was not, however, just an isolated reaction against the prevailing literary modes; in the strong revival of interest in Marot's works in the early part of the century Daniel Mornet has seen a deliberate rejection of the predominant literary values:

Par l'influence du libre 'style marotique', la résistance s'est poursuivie contre les exigences du style noble. Son exemple ouvrit sans cesse des Brèches dans la forteresse académique que l'ardeur du néologisme minait par un autre bout.⁷⁷

Likewise Gustave Lanson, in reference specifically to Lenglet's edition of Marot, has pointed out the political significance of this rejection of the literature of the 'grand siècle':

C'est sans doute le goût littéraire, mais aussi l'esprit philosophique qui s'y satisfont. Dans ce retour aux archaïsmes de langage, aux familiarités satiriques un peu grossières, il y a une réaction contre la tenue théâtrale, la noblesse pompeuse de l'époque de Louis XIV. Pour la même raison, Rabelais revient tout à fait en faveur.⁷⁸

One of the first of this group of works was the Oeuvres de Clément Marot, published early in 1731, under the pseudonym of the 'Chevalier Gordon de Percel',⁷⁹ who was ostensibly living in Brussels: the name and address were presumably suggested by those of his brother, Jacques Lenglet de Percel, whom we have seen had settled in that city. This sumptuous edition was published in the Hague in both quarto and duodecimo format; Michault remarks that 'L'éditeur n'étant pas en Hollande, lorsqu'on^{im} prima ce grand Ouvrage, il s'y est glissé quantité de fautes'.⁸⁰ Lenglet based his work mainly on the Niort edition of 1596,⁸¹ but he added a great deal of material: dedications and prefaces by Marot, more than 150 small pieces by, or attributed to the poet, poems written in his honour, etc.,⁸² and, of course, Lenglet's customary long Preface, a chronology of Marot's works, a glossary, and copious notes. As regards the editing of the text itself, Lenglet, in the Dedication, is at pains to point out the large number of sources he consulted: in addition to the Niort edition, he used original editions published by Marot himself, or his friends, collections published during the poet's lifetime, manuscripts which Lenglet found 'dans les plus illustres Bibliothèques de Paris', including that of the Duc de Bourbon. He mentions a specific incident where he had located a unique copy of a rare work attributed to Jean Marot, La Vrai-disant, Advocate des Dames, and went to bid for

it at a book-sale in 1729, but unfortunately for him the Comte de Hoym⁸³ had also noted the work and bid against him, so that Lenglet was obliged to buy at 'trente ou quarante fois au delà de sa valeur', i.e. 75 livres.⁸⁴ But despite this unfortunate clash, Hoym's magnificent library was still accessible to Lenglet, and he lists one of the manuscript items he found there;⁸⁵ moreover, Lenglet dedicated the edition to the Comte. In his 'Liste des Pièces Particulières à cette édition' Lenglet goes as far as to give the call numbers of the items in some libraries, such as, for example, those from the Baluze collection at the Bibliothèque du Roi.

Thus it is clear that Lenglet put his knowledge of old books and his acquaintance with the library stocks of Paris to use in the preparation of this and subsequent 'critical' editions; but his methodology was nonetheless haphazard, and contingent to a large extent upon whatever sources chance threw in his path. He did, for example, make some kind of rough comparison between his edition of the Advocate des Dames and the 'manuscrit original' in the Bourbon library;⁸⁶ but he makes no effort to justify, nor even to indicate, his final choice of one or the other source: was it based on historical or literary criteria? In most cases, Lenglet's decisions seem to have been purely arbitrary, and influenced undoubtedly by considerations of pressure of time and public taste. It would be difficult to disagree with Lionel Gossman's comment in contrasting this type of editing with the more careful, consistent, laborious approach of true 'scholars' like Lacurne de Sainte-Palaye:

Careless editors, like Lenglet du Fresnoy, for instance, might work from a printed edition, making arbitrary corrections here and there on the basis of manuscripts in their possession, which they referred to vaguely as 'ancien' or 'très ancien' but of which they rarely gave an adequate description. ⁸⁷

Yet many of Lenglet's editions were highly respected, which is in itself an indication of the extent to which the standards being developed and applied in the Academies were still foreign to the average reader. None of the critics who wrote reviews of the Marot raised the question at all: the Nouvelliste du Parnasse's only relevant remarks are:

C'est assurément une entreprise très-louable que d'avoir pris le soin de recueillir, de corriger, et d'éclaircir les Poésies de ce celebre Auteur... On peut dire que cette édition est estimable par plusieurs endroits. L'impression en est belle et correcte: les poesies de Jean Marot pere de Clement et de Michel fils de celui-ci s'y trouvent réunies. ⁸⁸

The abbé Goujet, writing in 1747, is no more probing in his judgement:

Il n'y avoit point eu encore d'édition plus complete et plus singulière des oeuvres [de Marot]. ⁸⁹

One might have expected a different response from Lenglet's biographer Michault, disciple of the Président Bouhier, but again the only judgement that can be applied to the editorial techniques is that the edition is 'plus magnifique qu'utile'. ⁹⁰

The critics were not so silent, however, on other aspects of the edition which were to give it notoriety, principally the long 'Préface historique sur les oeuvres de Clément Marot', and the notes. Their tone is hinted at by Lenglet in the Dedication, when he states that:

La revision de ce Poëte est le fruit d'une retraite involontaire, que j'ai rendue agréable par ces sortes d'amusements, et utile par des Etudes plus serieuses. ⁹¹

He is obviously referring here to his imprisonment of 1724-26; the abbé Goujet comments aptly on the statement:

On ne s'en apperçoit que trop[.] Ce n'est pas qu'on y voie regner cet esprit chagrin et austère que l'on contracte communément dans la retraite, et encore plus dans une retraite forcée: c'est tout le contraire. Il est difficile de porter plus loin l'excès de la liberté et de la joie. ⁹²

Obviously in search of novelty at any cost, Lenglet wrote his Preface, whose subject was the life and works of Marot, in the form of a dialogue between three friends; it is long and repetitive, the form being totally unsuited to the content; the characterisation is almost non-existent. The distinguishing feature, however, is the unrestrained tone of the conversation, which is filled with satiric gibes at the expense of other writers, and comments of a highly licentious nature; for example, in speaking of Marot's supposed mistresses, including Diane de Poitiers, one of Lenglet's characters exclaims:

Heureux le Poëte qui a eu de telles aventures! les bons morceaux, les morceaux délicats tombent presque toujours entre les mains des fous.

They also express some attitudes which one suspects to be close to the abbé's personal views. On the subject of poets who write out of self-interest one of them remarks:

Que serviroit-il de présenter des Odes, des Rondeaux, des Epîtres, des Epigrammes aux Princes et aux Ministres, si ce n'est pour obtenir d'eux ce qu'on prétend, et qu'on n'ose quelquefois leur demander en face. Sot qui les approche, si ce n'est pour en tirer la quintessence. Celui qui s'imagineroit qu'on le va voir, pour flechir seulement le genou, seroit bien la dupe de nos démarches, et de nos prétendus respects. J'aimerois mieux les fléchir devant une Maîtresse qui répondroit à la tendre inclination que j'aurois pour elle;

and Aristippe, speaking about subversive books, declares:

J'ay la coutume de ne jamais faire mettre sur le dos de la plupart des miens leur véritable nom. Il n'y a que les livres d'histoire et de mœurs qui ne soient pas déguisez; d'ailleurs je fais appliquer des titres spécieux sur ceux qui pourroient allarmer les ignorans, les fourbes ou les dévots. Ne croyez donc pas qu'on me trouve les Contes de La Fontaine, si ce n'est sous le masque des Devoirs de la vie Civile; ni l'Alcoran, sinon sous le titre de Pensées spirituelles. Jusqu'à présent cela m'a réussi. Ainsi à travers le grillage d'une tablette fermée à double clef, on entrevoit chez moy Le Chrétien interieur, les œuvres de M. de Bernieres, les Maximes et les Progrès de la vie spirituelle, l'Année Chrétienne, la Dévotion aisée, l'Homme d'Oraison, les Meditations de Dupont et d'Abély. Et tout cela néanmoins renferme ce qu'il y a de plus gay et de plus enjoué dans notre Litterature Italienne et Française. C'est par là, Ménandre, que je suis aimé des gens d'Eglise, estimé des Courtisans, et redouté des libertins. Suivez cette conduite,

c'est un des moyens les plus surs pour éviter ces accusations dogmatiques, toujours fâcheuses en quelque situation que l'on soit. ⁹³

The critics were unanimous in attacking these aspects of the Preface, although most to some extent concurred with the qualification added by the abbé Goujet:

Je conviendrai[.]qu'il y a dans cette préface des réflexions fort judicieuses, quelques anecdotes sur la vie de Marot qui ne peuvent venir que d'un Ecrivain qui s'est familiarisé avec les'oeuvres de ce Poète, et avec l'histoire du temps où celui-ci vivoit,

but few shared his views when he added 'que l'on y juge sainement du goût et du caractère de ses poésies'. ⁹⁴

Curiously, this Preface gave rise to an incident which may be at the origin of Lenglet's quarrel with the abbé Prévost, ⁹⁵ who recounts it in his Pour et contre in 1734:

Dans le tems que le Marot de M. de Percel s'imprimoit à Amsterdam, M. C... homme d'esprit et de sçavoir, qui corrigeoit cet Ouvrage, me fit la grace de me consulter sur la Préface, qu'il se faisoit un scrupule d'imprimer, parce qu'elle contenoit des Satyres infames contre quelques personnes respectables. Je répondis, aussi sincèrement que je le pensois, que son scrupule me paroissoit juste; et que malgré la nécessité où se trouve quelquefois un Correcteur de Hollande, de n'y pas regarder de si près, il étoit obligé néanmoins de faire toujours une juste distinction de certains Livres. Je mettois dans ce rang, sans exception, tous ceux qui attaquent ouvertement, et de dessein formé, la Religion Chrétienne, les bonnes moeurs, et l'honneur du prochain. Peut-être que M. C... a fait quelque retranchement à la Préface du Marot, et que M. de Percel a sçu que j'y ai contribué par mon conseil. ⁹⁶

Prévost typically gives himself le beau rôle, of which we shall see other manifestations at a later stage. As to whether there were corrections made before publication we have little proof, except in relation to a satire on J.-B. Rousseau, which was separate from the preface, and which was totally suppressed through another channel: ⁹⁷ it is apparently not to this item that Prévost refers. It is more than likely however that Lenglet heard of Prévost's comments through the

publishers, and thus bore one of his characteristic grudges against him.

Judgements similar to those expressed on the preface were applied to Lenglet's copious annotations, especially in volumes I and II. That of the Nouvelliste du Parnasse is fairly balanced; Lenglet is attacked for the low and vulgar tone of many of his remarks, some of which are simply ridiculous, and above all for the licentious nature of much of the material - 'Jamais on ne vit un commentateur François si libre dans ses Notes'.⁹⁸ The author also reproves Lenglet's satiric attacks on the magistrates, financiers and churchmen, particularly monks, which are innumerable: one may recall for example his references to the Sorbonne which he described as a 'tannière de pédans ignares et ennemis des bonnes choses'.⁹⁹ Nonetheless, the journalist admits:

J'avoüe que quelques-unes de ces Notes sont fort bonnes, particulièrement celles qui sont Historiques et Litteraires. On y lit sur tout avec plaisir des vers tirés de nos vieux Poëtes, et relatifs à certaines pensées de Marot. Les Notes enfin font juger que le Commentateur est très-versé dans l'Histoire du Regne de François I. et dans la lecture de nos anciens Poëtes, depuis Guillaume de Loris et Jean de Meun Auteurs du Roman de la Rose [...] jusqu'a Clement Marot.¹⁰⁰

Lenglet was to show further proof of his knowledge in the area in subsequent editions. However, few commentators failed to perceive the basic impulse behind Lenglet's editorial technique: the sort of material he chose to include not only swelled the number of volumes, but sold to a broader audience than would a more serious scholarly work.¹⁰¹ The good quality paper and printing, moreover, in which Lenglet always took pride, made for a decorative quarto set to grace any library, while the more modest section of the public had the choice of buying the duodecimo version, cheaper and easy to store. Perhaps for these more than any other reasons Lenglet's edition retained its popularity over a long

period, and was replaced only in 1823 by the Auguis edition.¹⁰²

In view of Lenglet's comments on patronage quoted above, it is not surprising that the Count Hoym should have assumed he would be looking for a financial recompense for his Dedication: he had left Paris in 1729, but he charged his embassy secretary, who had stayed behind, to sound Lenglet out on the kind of present he would find acceptable. He added that he did not intend to 'pousser la galanterie' to the extent of giving Lenglet any more than 100 pistoles (2000 francs).¹⁰³ The secretary duly approached Lenglet on the subject several times, but reported that:

[L'abbé] lui avait toujours paru fort délicat sur le chapitre, mais qu'il lui avait semblé très amoureux des porcelaines de Saxe, et qu'il était persuadé que l'abbé serait content s'il entraînait quelque chose de bon en ce genre dans la gratification que S.E. lui destinait.¹⁰⁴

Pichon expresses astonishment that Lenglet should have felt any such delicacy or disinterestedness; but the abbé does show such traits on a number of occasions where he seems to have felt a sincere respect for the person or the cause involved.¹⁰⁵

In the same year Lenglet edited a work which, though not in verse, can be grouped with the Cabinet satyrique, and indeed with the edition of Le Moyen de parvenir of 1732, as they undoubtedly aim at the same sort of market, and may conceivably have been produced by the same publisher in Holland: this was the Arrêts d'amour of Martial d'Auvergne (also called 'de Paris'), with the 'commentaires juridiques et joyeux' which had been added to them by Benoit de Court, a lawyer.¹⁰⁶ As the title suggests, the work is a series of light-hearted 'trials' or debates between men of the law on contentious questions relating to love; they were apparently written in imitation of the Provençal

'courts of love', but in a more satiric vein.¹⁰⁷ The work had first been published in the early 16th century in Latin, and later translated into French; it had not been republished for over a century.¹⁰⁸ Lenglet included in his volume a poem by Martial entitled 'L'Amant rendu cordelier à l'observance d'amours', and three extra 'arrêts' by other writers; his own notes are few, and refer mainly to L'Amant. The distinguishing features of the edition are again a long 'Avertissement', containing what Michault describes as 'des endroits curieux et piquans',¹⁰⁹ and a glossary of Old French terms, a feature which Lenglet particularly stresses in his preface: he feels this practice is of great value to scholars and general readers alike, for the existing dictionaries are frequently 'extrêmement defectueux pour connaître le premier âge de notre langue'. He intends to adopt the same procedure in subsequent editions of 'nos anciens auteurs' which he will publish in the future.

There was little attention paid to the edition by the periodical press: its existence was simply noted by the Mémoires de Trévoux as late as November 1734.¹¹⁰ Distribution by the Amsterdam publisher must have been slow, for in 1733 Lenglet decided to have the remaining copies brought to Paris, and sold openly, with a new title-page,¹¹¹ by the bookseller Gandouin, and surreptitiously by a colporteur named Stella;¹¹² according to Delort 'l'ouvrage fut très-recherché'.¹¹³ Soon however a letter of complaint was sent to the Lieutenant de Police by another Parisian libraire, Pierre Guérin, who began:

L'abbé Lenglet, dont les ouvrages ont toujours attiré l'attention de la Police, vient de faire imprimer en Hollande des Arrêts d'Amours, dont il a introduit un nombre d'Exemplaires dans cette ville de Paris par des voies détournées.¹¹⁴

The subject of the complaint was the insults Lenglet had aimed at the late bookseller Antoine Urbain Coustelier and his widow, whom Guérin had since married:

Dans la Préface que l'abbé Lenglet a mis à la tête de cette édition page 25. en parlant des Poésies de Martial d'Auvergne, il dit que l'Edition en a été publiée à Paris en 1724, par un petit etourdi qui suivoit toujours mauvais conseil &c. et à la page 35. en parlant des Vigiles de la mort du Roy Charles VII. il cite l'édition faite à Paris en 1724 chez Antoine Urbain Coustelier, bon Libraire et Archi-Cocu. //6

Guérin demands a 'réparation d'honneur convenable à la qualité et à la publicité de l'injure qu'il fait à l'Epouse dudit Guérin'.¹¹⁷ One may well wonder why Lenglet poured such venom on the unfortunate Coustelier. It will be remembered, however, that the latter had published Lenglet's Méthode pour étudier l'histoire in 1713, so it seems likely that when the bookseller decided to produce a series of editions on the anciens poètes in the early 1720's he would have approached the abbé on the subject. Coustelier's collection eventually consisted of ten volumes, which included the works of Pathelin, Villon, Marot,¹¹⁸ Coquillart, and Martial himself (excluding the two works published by Lenglet).¹¹⁹ These are all works which the latter at some time worked on in an editorial capacity: it was precisely in the early 1720 s, during his trip to Vienna, that we saw him pouring over 'Pathelin, Villon, Cocquillart',¹²⁰ none of whose works he actually published.¹²¹ His efforts were obviously thwarted by the publication of a rival editor's work 'chez Coustelier'. Likewise in February 1724 a notice in the Mercure de France stated that Coustelier was about to publish the Roman de la rose, and in April the bookseller declared that the work was almost ready:¹²² but the edition never materialised, probably because of the libraire's death in that year; the first subsequent edition was that published by Lenglet in 1735. One may speculate on the reasons for the cooling of an initially promising relationship between the abbé and Coustelier. In the Mercure article in April Coustelier defended his editions against charges of inadequate, or non-existent critical editing; he declared

that his early intention had been to find 'd'habiles Editeurs' to annotate the texts, but this task proved more difficult than he had foreseen:

Mes amis [...] me firent appercevoir que le nombre de ceux qui étoient versez dans ce genre de Litterature n'étoit pas considerable, qu'il falloit necessairement posseder de longue main nos anciens Auteurs des xiv. xv. & xvi. siecles, être rompu dans la lecture des Historiens, Poètes, et autres Ecrivains de ces mêmes siecles, sans quoi il seroit impossible de sortir avec honneur de ce travail; [...] ainsi qu'il ne falloit me livrer, et m'engager avec aucun Editeur qu'à bonnes enseignes. En effet, plusieurs années se sont passées à essayer de déterrer quelqu'un en état de donner nos Poètes du moyen âge, et qui en même temps ne se trouvât point engagé dans d'autres travaux Litteraires: & c'étoit-là, Monsieur, le point essentiel.¹²³

When we recall that Lenglet was absent from Paris from September 1721 for about two years, a large part of which time he spent in prison, and that he was again arrested in March 1724, it seems very likely that Coustelier, who had previously come to an agreement with him, grew tired of waiting for his material, and decided to go ahead with the publication of the texts which, as he underlines in the Mercure article, were in very high demand.¹²⁴ Lenglet's wrath at having to stow away the material he had worked hard to prepare would be more than sufficient to account for the first of the comments quoted above; his anger can scarcely have been soothed by the fact that the Coustelier editions became extremely popular,¹²⁵ though largely for their fine material presentation.

With regard to Coustelier's widow, we have seen that she undertook to publish Lenglet's second edition of the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire in 1729, but withdrew from the project, thus adding further fuel to the flames: this is no doubt why she too is implicated in the second insult quoted by Guérin. After the complaint was lodged Lenglet

was summoned by M. Hérault, Lieutenant général de police, to answer the charges,¹²⁶ and according to Delort 'Le commissaire d'Espinay, et Vannecourt, exempt de robe courte, se transportèrent chez lui (Il logeait alors rue Chapon, au bureau des Tireurs d'or). Les alguazils ne trouvèrent aucun exemplaire de l'édition'.¹²⁷ We have no record of what exactly transpired, but Lenglet does not appear to have suffered any imprisonment at this time: one may assume however that he was obliged by Hérault to remove the offending remarks from the remaining copies of the book, as is witnessed by the cartons in a number of those I have seen.¹²⁸

Also in 1731 appeared the Réfutation des Erreurs de Benoit de Spinoza, par M. de Fénelon Archevêque de Cambray, par le P. Lami Bénédictin et par M. le Comte de Boulainvilliers: avec la Vie de Spinoza, écrite par M. Jean Colerus, Ministre de l'Eglise Luthérienne de la Haye; augmentée de beaucoup de particularités tirées d'une Vie manuscrite de ce Philosophe, faite par un de ses amis,¹²⁹ one of the most notorious of Lenglet's editions, which can be related in its conception to the 1729 edition of the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire. This was an important contribution to the dissemination of Spinozist ideas in the first half of the eighteenth century,¹³⁰ for the title of Réfutation was a fairly transparent subterfuge: even a cursory glance at the contents shows that the major elements, counting for approximately three-quarters of the total number of pages, are the essay on Spinoza by Boulainvilliers, misleadingly entitled 'Réfutation' (all the early manuscript copies extant being entitled 'Essai de métaphysique dans les pⁿncipes de B. de Spinoza), and the 'Vie', again falsely attributed solely to Colerus. The 'Réfutation' by Fénelon which figures first in

the title, turns out to be simply an 'Extrait d'une lettre de Monseigneur de Fénelon, Archevêque Duc du Cambray, sur la Réfutation de Spinoza', and is only ten pages long.¹³¹ Moreover, it does not constitute a clear attempt to refute Spinoza's ideas; Voltaire, who had a copy of the edition, noted in it 'Si Mgr. de Fénelon est l'auteur de cet écrit, Mgr. a fait un bien mauvais ouvrage'.¹³²

In his 'Avertissement' Lenglet declared:

Il y a peu d'Auteurs qui ayent fait autant de bruit que Spinoza: La singularité de ses opinions ou plutôt de ses impiétés a engagé tous les Theologiens à les examiner. La plupart sont si abstraites que peu de personnes les ont bien entendues; ainsi peu de personnes les ont bien réfutées;

the writers he has chosen are implicitly among those few 'grands Philosophes' who did succeed in this task. When he speaks of Henri de Boulainvilliers a few pages later it is evident that Lenglet greatly admires the writer, and is conversant with his works:

Le troisième Ouvrage vient de feu le Comte Charles [sic.] de Boulainvilliers, homme d'une extrême pénétration, d'un travail infatigable et d'une si forte méditation, qu'il était surprenant de voir un homme de sa Naissance joindre des réflexions si profondes à une érudition aussi grande et aussi variée que la Sienne;

we have already indicated the extent to which Lenglet 'borrowed' from his Abrégé d'histoire universelle in the 1729 edition of the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire. Many of the Comte's writings were circulated exclusively in manuscript; I.O. Wade has shown the place held by Boulainvilliers' unpublished works within the clandestine movement of ideas.¹³³ Few of them could be described as orthodox, and many showed a strong Spinozist influence; but they were written, as we have seen, mainly for the Comte's coterie of intellectuals, nobles of either sword or robe, and were never intended for wide circulation in printed form. If Boulainvilliers did not therefore write to please the censor,

neither was he aiming at the scandalous renown attached to many of those writers who chose to use the presses of Holland in order to circumvent the French administration.¹³⁴ Lenglet, however, as we have seen, had innumerable contacts both amid the scholars of the robe, and the organisers of the illicit booktrade: indeed he tells us that the manuscript copy of the Essai de métaphysique which he used in the preparation of his edition 'est la même qu'il [Boulainvilliers] voulut confier en mourant à un de ses amis'.¹³⁵ It would seem that he 'discovered' Boulainvilliers' work in the 1720's, most likely through friends of the Comte, and he could not resist exploiting such a wealth of unpublished material; he states openly in his 'Avertissement':

Nous avons encore d'autres Ouvrages de ce savant homme que l'on pourra publier un jour, pour faire honneur à la mémoire d'une personne si digne de veneration et de respect.

Boulainvilliers had died in 1722, and a number of his works had already been published over the following decade, as for example the Vie de Mahomed in Amsterdam in 1730; but even in Holland the essay on Spinoza was regarded as dangerous material, as we are told by one of Lenglet's critics in the Hague:

L'Editeur, qui a bien senti, que, malgré la Liberté de la Presse, il n'y a point de Libraire dans ce Pais, qui eût ôsé imprimer ce Livre, a jugé à propos d'en changer le Titre; et, par une Hardiesse, dont il y a peu d'Exemples, il en a mis un contradictoire à celui de l'Auteur.¹³⁶

This is no doubt also one of the reasons why the edition carried a 'Bruxelles' imprint, although the work was actually published in Amsterdam:¹³⁷ it would help to confuse the Dutch authorities, and it would also be more respectable in the eyes of the French administration than the notorious Dutch editions if the books were seized at the customs. As to Lenglet's real motivation, one may suspect, along with contemporary critics,¹³⁸ that it stemmed as much from financial

considerations as from the 'respect' for Boulainvilliers cited above: the popularity of the latter's works was amply proven by the high demand for his manuscripts, it only took the audacity of one willing to brave the administration to cash in on a sure market. The abbé seemed to take progressively less account of the risks attendant upon selling such a work in France: he had no social position to lose, and his familiarity with royal prisons may well, as Michault asserts, have bred in him a certain contempt, or at least indifference towards them.¹³⁹

The Essai de métaphysique then is neither a refutation of Spinoza, nor a close 'objective' analysis of his Ethics;¹⁴⁰ Boulainvilliers considers a number of the philosopher's ideas as expressed in that essay under two general headings - 'De l'Etre en général et en particulier' and 'Des Passions' - teasing out their implications and relating them to his own immediate interests.¹⁴¹ Having followed, in the first section, Spinoza's rejection of the Christian concepts of God, and his assertion of the impossibility of accepting Christian revelation under the laws of evidence, he is naturally led in the second half of the treatise to re-examine Christian principles of morality. Gustave Lanson summed up his judgement of the Essai as follows:

Ce qui est clair, c'est que Boulainvilliers est moins un spinoziste qu'un homme curieux de Spinoza, et qui se sert de Spinoza pour légitimer les attitudes nouvelles vers lesquelles il est porté: respect mêlé d'indifférence pour les cultes établis; idée de la tolérance; morale purement humaine, avec des sanctions toutes terrestres; conception antique de vie retirée et silencieuse, sans grand souci métaphysique: voilà ce qu'il y a de positif dans son livre. Boulainvilliers a saisi dans Spinoza ce qui pouvait mettre à l'aise ses propres tendances à la libre recherche spéculative.¹⁴²

Nonetheless it is still true to say that Boulainvilliers' essay played a significant rôle in the dissemination and popularization of Spinozist

thought in France: firstly it was much more readable and attractive to a wider public than the difficult Ethics on which it was based.¹⁴³ Moreover it was, Paul Vernière emphasises, more faithful in its treatment of Spinoza's thought than had been Bayle, Lami and other imprudent apologists who deformed it into a materialistic atheism; Boulainvilliers retained the pantheistic formulae of the original. And far from being timid, on some points Boulainvilliers goes courageously beyond his text and draws an argument to its logical, if unorthodox, conclusions. Vernière goes as far as to wonder whether Lenglet, in publishing the Essai, had not the express intention of putting a halt to 'les interprétations fantaisistes de Spinoza';¹⁴⁴ he concludes his analysis with the assertion:

C'est un fait que Boulainvillier, tout autant et plus que Bayle, demeure le véritable introducteur du spinozisme en France; sa prétendue réfutation, répandue en manuscrits dès 1712, et imprimée en 1731, sera le bréviare du spinozisme au XVIIIe siècle; elle dispensera bien souvent Voltaire et Diderot de recourir au texte latin.

It has been asserted that Lenglet was responsible for the artificial creation of a 'legendary Boulainvilliers, antireligious propagandist and covert disciple of Spinoza'.¹⁴⁶ The evidence on which Professor Torrey bases his contention is, firstly, the change of title from 'Essai de métaphysique' to 'Réfutation de Spinoza', which was then used as a transparent camouflage for the whole edition; but more importantly he asserts that the 'Préface de M. le Comte De Boulainvilliers' which precedes the 'Essai',¹⁴⁷ was in turn 'a very clever editorial justification for the change of title'. In this Preface the author does indeed state that his original purpose in writing the essay was ultimately to refute Spinoza, whose posthumous works had conveniently fallen into his hands:

Il me parut d'une telle conséquence, que dans l'espoir de combattre moi-même quelque jour le plus dangereux livre qui ait été écrit

contre la Religion, ou du moins dans l'espérance d'engager un plus habile Métaphysicien que moi, à le réfuter, j'ai entrepris de le dépouiller de cette Sécheresse Mathématique, qui en rend la lecture impraticable, même à la moitié des Scavans; afin que le Système rendu dans une langue commune, et réduit à des expressions ordinaires, pût être en état d'exciter une indignation pareille à la mienne, et procurer, par ce moyen, de véritables ennemis à de si pernicioeux principes.¹⁴⁸

He asserts that, far from 'watering down' Spinoza's ideas, he has exaggerated their implications and pushed them to their logical conclusions, the better to clarify the issues.¹⁴⁹ But such an endeavour is obviously in itself neutral, and could as easily be used for the propagation as for the refutation of Spinoza's ideas; nor could Boulainvilliers' attitude throughout the 'Essai' be interpreted as hostile to Spinoza. On these observations Torrey based his argument that the Preface was written by Lenglet: the only material evidence offered to substantiate the claim is the fact that the 'Vie de Spinoza' and Boulainvilliers' Preface are paginated continuously, and are separate from the 'Essai' proper which is part of another series - a fact which can more plausibly be attributed to the convenience of the printers than to any editorial decision. Professor Torrey then surmises that Lenglet's fabricated 'Préface' was subsequently added to pre-existing manuscript copies of Boulainvilliers' work, of which he gives the Bibliothèque Nationale manuscript as an example.¹⁵⁰ However, a cursory survey of the manuscript copies of the 'Essai' in Parisian libraries is sufficient to refute this argument.¹⁵¹ All of them, including the two B.N. copies quoted by Professor Torrey, contain the 'Préface' of the 1731 edition under the title 'Avertissement'; in most copies it is clearly written in the same hand as the body of the Essai. A number of these copies can be positively dated as preceding the publication of Lenglet's edition. It suffices to mention the two copies in the Arsenal library: both of these were inherited by the Marquis de Paulmy from his father, the

Marquis d'Argenson, a personal friend and admirer of Boulainvilliers.¹⁵²

On ms. 2235 there is a note, obviously written in Paulmy's name:

Ce ms est sûrement curieux et précieux. J'ay lieu de croire qu'il est de M. de Boulainvilliers, parcequ'il me vient de mon père qui avoit eu de grandes relations avec luy et que celui-cy possédoit la plupart de ses manuscrits.

This copy is bound with the d'Argenson arms. In ms. 2236 the title-page, which precedes the 'Avertissement', reads 'Essay de métaphysique [.] composé par M.L.C.D.C.D.B., et copié sur l'original de l'auteur, au mois d'aoust 1712'. The whole manuscript is written in the same hand, and the binding can be almost certainly ascribed to the first quarter of the eighteenth century.¹⁵³

In view of the material proofs offered by these and other manuscripts, the attribution of the 'Préface' to Lenglet must be positively refuted. It is taken directly from an existing manuscript, with only minor variants from the main-stream tradition: for example the reference to 'les trois traités suivans' which occurs in the majority of manuscripts is modified to 'les Traitez suivants' to suit the form of the edition. The astute circumvention of accusations of unorthodoxy and irreligion in the Preface must be ascribed to Boulainvilliers himself, and Professor Torrey's effort to restore Boulainvilliers' image as a 'bien-pensant' philosopher, unconscious of the unorthodoxy of his own work, is seriously undermined. I.⁹C. Wade has pointed to the importance of this method of presenting 'advanced' ideas, the 'apostolic bow', which was to become a commonplace procedure among the philosophes ; Lenglet was only following the Comte's lead when he changed the title of the work to 'Réfutation', but it was a method he was to adopt on many subsequent occasions.

The 'Vie de Spinoza' which Lenglet published was, in fact, a fairly crude mixture of the two available lives of the philosopher; the first, La vie de B. de Spinoza...par Jean Colérus Ministre de l'église luthérienne de la Haye, published in the Hague in 1706, is a simple, apparently unbiased account by a Lutheran minister whose predecessor had been a personal friend of Spinoza, and it shows admiration for the man without supporting his views. The second piece, from which Lenglet quotes large passages verbatim, is La Vie de Spinoza, par un de ses disciples, by Jean-Maximilien Lucas, a doctor from the Hague, and, as the title indicates, an admirer of his philosophy.¹⁵⁴ This, Lenglet claimed, he found in manuscript form, although in fact it had been published twice previously: first in Holland in 1712,¹⁵⁵ but only in a very limited edition of which all remaining copies were burnt at the death of the publisher.¹⁵⁶ and again in the Nouvelles littéraires of 1719 where Lenglet could well have seen it.¹⁵⁷ The fusion of the two versions not surprisingly resulted in some startlingly contradictory views.¹⁵⁸

The other items in the volume were the short extract from a letter by Fénelon already mentioned, and an 'Extrait du nouvel athéisme renversé, ou refutation du système de Spinoza', by the Benedictine Dom François Lami, which Michault qualified in the following terms:

L'extrait [...] n'est aussi qu'une fausse quintessence. Les arguments de Spinoza sont rapportés dans cet Extrait avec beaucoup de méthode, d'une manière capable d'éblouir et de faire illusion peut-être à ceux-mêmes qui se flattent de justesse d'esprit; au lieu que les Réponses que l'on y fait sont vagues, et ne consistent la plupart qu'en des exclamations, des railleries qui ne peuvent tout au plus faire impression que sur des génies superficiels.¹⁵⁹

The last piece is the 'Certamen philosophicum propugnatae veritatis divinae ac naturalis adversus Joh. Bredenburg' by Isaac Orobio, first published in Amsterdam in 1681; it is a series of four dissertations

in which Orobio refutes the principles of Bredenburg whom he says was imbued with Spinozist atheism.¹⁶⁰ Bredenburg in turn defends himself against Orobio's accusations, but his defence itself shows Socinian tendencies.¹⁶¹ Orobio, however, a Jewish doctor living in Holland,¹⁶² was himself notorious for his anti-Christian sentiments, and his name would hardly have lent respectability to a purportedly orthodox Réfutation de Spinoza; on the contrary the rare item held obvious attractions for the free-thinking public at whom the Boulainvilliers text was aimed. Significantly it does not figure on the title-page, although it counts for almost 100 pages of the text, as against the 11 pages of Fénelon's letter.

It is difficult to gauge with certainty the impact made by the edition. The only significant critiques devoted to it appeared in journals published in Holland;¹⁶³ both the Bibliothèque raisonnée and the Journal littéraire clearly expose Lenglet's subterfuge, and condemn strongly the publication of a work as subversive as Boulainvilliers' essay which aims at popularising Spinoza's pernicious 'système'. The Bibliothèque raisonnée makes the following comment on the editor of the work:

Pour le Compileur, ~~on peut assurer, sans le connoître plus particulièrement,~~ que c'est ou un Ignorant, ou un Fourbe, ou un Spinosiste,¹⁶⁴

and some pages later goes as far as to name the abbé:

Après tout ce qu'on vient de lire, qui ne seroit pas surpris d'apprendre que l'Editeur de ce Volume est un Ecclésiastique Catholique Romain, fameux dans la République des Lettres, etc. en un mot de l'Abbé Lenglet; c'est en dire assez.¹⁶⁵

The Journal littéraire published its critique some time after the appearance of the edition for fear, the editors claimed, that they should be responsible for advertising a work which initially was sold

only surreptitiously:

L'Ouvrage ne se vendoit que sous le manteau, et nous crûmes qu'il étoit dangereux d'apprendre au Public, qu'on venoit d'imprimer, dans une des principales Villes de cette Province, un Livre, dont le But, sous un faux titre, étoit d'établir le Spinosisme. Mais, depuis, l'Ouvrage a été répandu dans le Pais; on l'a annoncé dans les Gazettes; et il se trouve chez tous les Libraires: de sorte que les mêmes Raisons, qui nous avoient engagés à nous taire, nous portent maintenant à parler. ¹⁶⁶

One suspects that the writer's fears were well founded, for these critiques could only serve to whet the appetite of those readers who avidly sought out such unorthodox material. Guillaume de Bure in his Bibliographie instructive asserted that the 'Réfutation[...] a été supprimée, et elle est plus rare que l'ouvrage de Spinosà', ¹⁶⁷ which statement is reiterated by Peignot in his Dictionnaire critique, littéraire et bibliographique des principaux livres condamnés au feu. ¹⁶⁸

Nonetheless Paul Vernière demonstrated that the work was widely disseminated in France: out of 79 catalogues of private libraries published between 1731 and 1739, 25 included Lenglet's edition, from which Vernière concluded that 'le succès en fut prodigieux'. ¹⁶⁹

Certainly no remark as to the scarcity of copies was made by Lenglet's biographer Michault in 1761. The only evidence regarding a suppression of the work is the comment in the Journal littéraire quoted above which suggests that there were problems initially in distributing the work in Holland, but these seem to have been quickly overcome. A large number of copies were evidently smuggled into France.

The year 1731 also witnessed Lenglet's first incursion into a new area of interest with the publication of his only novel: La Catanoise, ou histoire secrète des mouvements arrivés au royaume de Naples, sous la Reine Jeanne I, which was published in Paris by Gandouin 'avec approbation et privilège du Roi'. ¹⁷⁰ This too was perhaps the fruit of

his years in prison: the manuscript was in fact completed by early 1728.¹⁷¹ The plot is based on historical accounts of a poor but ambitious 'blanchisseuse' from Catania in Sicily who, having got access to the court of Charles II as a wet-nurse, gradually improved her position by devious means until she became confidente and favourite of Jeanne I, queen of Naples from 1343-1382. Her crimes culminated in the murder of the Queen's husband André, for which she was finally executed. Lenglet probably took the basic elements of the story from an earlier novel by Pierre Matthieu, Histoire des prospérités malheureuses d'une femme Cathenoise, published in 1618;¹⁷² but, as the abbé Goujet remarked in the Bibliothèque française, 'l'auteur fait plusieurs digressions galantes qui paroissent étrangers au sujet principal',¹⁷³ digressions which are lengthy and distracting but which Lenglet obviously felt were an essential ingredient for a novel. The characterisation is very poor, the style stilted and weighty. The Bibliothèque universelle des romans in 1781 described the book as 'un mélange indigeste d'histoire et de fiction'.¹⁷⁴ Contemporary critics were kinder, partly no doubt because they did not discover the identity of the author; although somewhat ironic on the subject of the 'digressions galantes', the Bibliothèque française concluded that 'Ce livre est bien écrit et est propre pour les gens qui ne cherchent qu'à s'amuser'.¹⁷⁵ Likewise the Nouvelliste du Parnasse, equally ironic on the subject of the colourful sub-plots and the weak characterisation, finished the article with the statement: 'On peut dire en general qu'on lit cet ouvrage avec plaisir, et qu'il est assez bien écrit'.¹⁷⁶ In his published Bibliothèque des romans Lenglet's only comment on his novel was to ascribe a moral purpose to it:

Cette Historiette doit apprendre aux Souverains à bien choisir leurs Favoris. C'est de là souvent que dépend leur bonheur ou leur malheur, leur bonne ou leur mauvaise réputation, ¹⁷⁷

But in his own copy he added a manuscript note to the effect that it was 'passablement écrite', ¹⁷⁸ which would suggest that he was himself a more severe critic of novelistic writing than the journalists quoted above. More interesting by far would be Lenglet's reflections on the novel genre, written around the same period, and published some three years later. The novel was, of course, published anonymously: ¹⁷⁹ it was not acceptable for a cleric, however nominal, to admit openly to this level of frivolous writing.

Also anonymous was yet another edition of an early seventeenth-century work, Le Moyen de parvenir by Béroalde de Verville, which Lenglet published in 1732, almost certainly in Holland, and which was again distributed clandestinely in France. ¹⁸⁰ This was a work beloved of the libertins, described in Gay's Bibliographie des ouvrages relatifs à l'amour in the following terms:

Sous le prétexte d'un dîner plantureux entre personnages anciens et modernes: Platon et Rabelais, Plutarque et Ramus, Bère et Pythagoras, Cicéron et Cardan, César et Mécénas, Margot et Alcibiade, Arétin et Pierre l'Hermite, Sapho et Calvin, Chose et l'autre, Quelqu'un et l'évêque, etc., c'est un ramassis sans queue ni tête, à la diable, de contes plaisants, de facéties licencieuses, de calembredaines singulières sur la philosophie, la religion, la vertu. C'est une critique, à la Rabelais, des moines, des femmes, des écrivains, du mariage; des coups de fouet à nu, en pleine chair, sur tous les membres de la société civile et religieuse. C'est un bavardage intempéré entre gens spirituels et savants qui ont bien mangé, mais encore mieux bu. S'ils cherchent le quolibet et tirent un peu le calembour, ils ne cherchent pas l'historiette faisandée, elle vient toute chaude, nue et éhontée, se placer entre les verres. ¹⁸¹

Lenglet has added an introductory 'Dissertation' by Bernard de La Monnoye, a 'Table des matières' and headlines in the margins, all of which, he assures us, 'rendra la lecture de ce livre plus agréable et plus facile'. ¹⁸² There were at least three subsequent editions during

Lenglet's lifetime, though he himself may not have been directly responsible for all of them: there was nothing to stop the booksellers 'pirating' such a publication. A further edition with new notes appeared in 1757 and is generally attributed to Lenglet but as he died in 1755 it is more likely that it was the work of another editor.¹⁸³

This year, 1732, was a troubled one for Lenglet, for about this time began a far-reaching battle with Jean-Baptiste Rousseau. It will be remembered that Lenglet had been friendly with the poet during the early part of his stay in Vienna in 1721-22, and that Rousseau had introduced him to a number of personages at the court.¹⁸⁴ They had even planned to travel to Brussels and Holland together, as both of them had business there.¹⁸⁵ But this state of friendly relations did not last for long, and we have seen how Dubourg, the French envoy to Vienna, spoke to Rousseau about Lenglet, and asked him to sound out Prince Eugene's attitude to the abbé, which he agreed to do. Rousseau reported back to Dubourg his whole conversation with the Prince who had criticised Lenglet in strong terms, telling the poet:

Cet homme[...] est plus qu'équivoque, et je vous avertis que c'est ce qu'on peut appeller un fort malhonneste homme, avec lequel vous ferez bien de n'avoir de commerce que pour ne le pas indisposer. Car ce sont des gens dangereux, il m'a fait personnellement une telle friponnerie.¹⁸⁶

This account was in turn communicated to the Minister Dubois in Paris.¹⁸⁷ Rousseau cooled off his relations with Lenglet and made an excuse for not travelling with him, which may have raised questions in the abbé's mind; he was not, however, left only to surmise the reasons for Rousseau's change of heart, for Dubois did not bother to hide the sources of his information. During Lenglet's captivity in Strasbourg

the Cardinal addressed a list of questions to him, and two of these were such as to leave him little room for doubting Rousseau's rôle of informer in this affair:

- 16° Qui est-ce qui a donné sujet à Mr le Prince Eugène de Conseiller à Mr Rousseau de ne pas faire le voyage de France avec Mr l'abbé Lenglet[.]
- 17° Qui a pu donner lieu à M. le Prince Eugène de croire que M. l'abbé Lenglet était mal intentionné pour le gouvernement de France. ¹⁸⁸

In view of the evidence given above it was clearly in bad faith that Rousseau wrote to a sympathiser in Paris in December 1732, protesting that Lenglet had no grounds for complaint against him:

Ce ne fut qu'à mon retour du mois de juillet suivant que j'appris qu'il avait été arrêté à Strasbourg où il était resté dix mois en prison, et qu'à sa sortie il avait écrit à Vienne que c'était moi qui l'avais fait mettre en prison, sur les avis que j'avais donné au ministre. Je vous laisse à juger de l'extravagance de cette plainte. Il serait bien aisé, si la chose en valait la peine, d'en vérifier la fausseté au bureau des affaires étrangères, et je ne doute point qu'on ne trouve les lettres que M. du Bourg a écrites en ce temps là et dans lesquelles je suis persuadé, si ce qu'il m'a dit est vrai, qu'on ne trouvera rien qui charge l'abbé Lenglet par rapport à l'Etat, du moins sur aucun fait qui soit venu à ma connaissance. ¹⁸⁹

This affair was at the origin of Lenglet's hatred of Rousseau; as we know, he was not a man easily to forget a bad turn, and this time he had a year in prison in a remote province to brood over his ills. We have seen that immediately after his release he published an edition of those works which Rousseau had prudently omitted from his Oeuvres diverses because of their licentious nature; but it was in 1731 that he finally took what he saw as a fitting revenge. He wrote an 'Eloge historique de Rousseau', dated January of that year, which was a satirical 'Epître' attacking the poet on both literary and personal grounds. ¹⁹⁰ The major accusations made concern his alleged plagiarisation of unpublished works of Marot, his satirisation of persons who had been

his friends and patrons, and, most grave of all, his attraction to sodomy: the terms of this last attack are ambiguous enough to be applied either to Rousseau's life or work.¹⁹¹ The piece is full of evident personal spite, and lacks humour: the style is heavy with overstatement. In his many notes Lenglet makes several references to his visit to Vienna and his personal contact with Rousseau: his statements are blatantly untrue at many points, as, for example, when he claims that Prince Eugene, who had already fallen out with Rousseau, reproached him for having gone to visit the poet. We have already seen above that it was Lenglet himself who was snubbed by the Prince.¹⁹² In two further notes Lenglet gives hint of those reasons for his animosity which we have already established, and brands Rousseau as a petty spy.¹⁹³

The attempts made by Lenglet to publish this 'Epître' have a long and extremely involved history, and as they have been dealt with in detail by Paul Bonnefon in his article on 'Jean-Baptiste Rousseau et Lenglet du Fresnoy',¹⁹⁴ I will consider only its broad outlines here. Lenglet had originally planned to publish the piece in Holland as a satirical dedication to his Marot edition;¹⁹⁵ but for whatever reasons, whether outside interference or personal choice is not altogether clear, he decided instead to use it as the dedication to his edition of the Satires et autres oeuvres de Régnier.¹⁹⁶ This work had only in 1729 been published in London by Claude Brossette, a personal friend of Rousseau's,¹⁹⁷ but Lenglet had more or less pirated the edition and was having it printed on his own account in Amsterdam: he added the 'Epître' which he made bold to sign with Brossette's name. Rousseau used all his influence in Holland to have the satire suppressed: he

approached Don Luiz da Cunha, plenipotentiary of the king of Portugal who was at that time residing in the Hague, and who in turn persuaded other diplomats to intervene in his favour with the States General.¹⁹⁸

Lenglet thought he could attack Rousseau with impunity from French soil, for the poet had, as we have seen, been banished from his homeland in 1712. He wrote a letter to the Marquis de Fénelon, French ambassador to the Hague, in which he at once denied being the author of the piece in question, and asked the ambassador not to oppose its publication.¹⁹⁹

He took the bizarre decision to visit the Duc d'Arenberg, former general in Prince Eugene's army, who had an hôtel in Paris.²⁰⁰ d'Arenberg was a known friend and patron of Rousseau's, and Lenglet supposedly hoped to convince him, through the eloquence of his 'Epître', of Rousseau's turpitude. The incident occurred in August 1732: Lenglet arrived one morning at the Duc's lever and handed him the satire to read. D'Arenberg skimmed over the first page and returned the sheets to the abbé 'en lui disant que cela était grossier'.²⁰¹ Unluckily for Lenglet a correspondent of both Brossette and Rousseau named de Lasseré arrived on the scene at that moment and asked to see the piece;²⁰² he quickly surmised that it could not be the work of Brossette and, as he recounts himself:

Ne connaissant point cet homme, je lui marquai ma surprise de voir votre nom au bas d'une telle satire. Il me répondit que c'était l'ouvrage de gens piqués qui exhalaient leur bile sous votre nom, à quoi je criai à la calomnie punissable des plus grands supplices. Mon vilain lève le siège sans réplique et court encore.²⁰³

Having ascertained that Lenglet was himself the author of the piece de Lasseré immediately informed Brossette, and moreover brought the matter to the attention of Hérault, Lieutenant général de Police. The latter summoned Lenglet and gave him a 'verte réprimande', ordering him to write a letter of apology to Brossette which the Lieutenant would him-

self transmit. Lenglet swore that he had only one printed copy of the 'Epître', and this he was obliged to surrender; he was warned not to try printing it again in either France or Holland.²⁰⁴ The letter which Lenglet finally wrote gave an undertaking never to publish it under Brossette's name, and gave the latter permission to publish his letter should he ever break his promise; but Lenglet refused to promise never to publish it under his own name.²⁰⁵ Nor, indeed, did he give any undertaking with regard to the Régnier edition itself; Brossette had cause for bitter complaint in December 1732 when Lenglet compounded his crimes by borrowing the name of 'M. Desmaizeaux',²⁰⁶ to write to the editor of the Journal littéraire about the new Régnier edition. The letter was a 'tissu de mensonges, de suppositions, d'impostures' whose aim was to convince the public that the work was being published by Tonson in London, and that Brossette had himself added the notes and poems particular to this second edition, which were mostly of a highly obscene nature.²⁰⁷

The atmosphere in Paris must have been rather unhealthy for our abbé at this period; Brossette writing to Bouhier in December 1732 reports with regard to Lenglet:

Les bruits qui ont couru de sa retraite à la Trape, sont sans aucun fondement, et je ne sache pas qu'il ait jamais eu la moindre vocation pour un parti si extraordinaire.²⁰⁸

One may wonder however if Lenglet circulated such rumours in order to forestall further judicial pursuit; we may recall a previous occasion when he chose retreat to a religious house as an alternative to possible imprisonment.²⁰⁹ There is, however, trace of an 'abbé Dufresnoy' in the records of the Bastille for April 1733,²¹⁰ but given the evidence of Lenglet's continuous publishing activities at this time it is unlikely that he is the person in question.

The combined efforts of Rousseau and his friends finally succeeded not only in having the 'Epître' suppressed in Holland, but also the Régnier edition itself:²¹¹ the printer had to stop the presses at the signature M, and there matters remained for some time.²¹² We learn of Lenglet's difficulties from a correspondent of Brossette's in Amsterdam in January 1733:

Il se flatte toujours d'avoir main levée des feuilles qui sont arrêtées ici. L'imprimeur demande le paiement de ces feuilles et on lui demande de finir l'ouvrage; mais la force majeure le retient. Il est nanti de 70 rames de papier du prix de 17 à 18 livres de votre monnaie chacune qui peuvent lui tenir lieu de paiement. Le marchand qui l'a fourni veut en être payé et va procéder. 2/3

But in October Brossette heard that the ban on the edition had been lifted,²¹⁴ and he again attempted to have it suppressed through the Marquis de Fénelon; all he could obtain initially was an order from the magistrates of Amsterdam that his name should not appear anywhere in the new edition,²¹⁵ nor, of course, could Lenglet risk putting in the 'Epître' to Rousseau. But he was not yet defeated, and by a spectacular tour de main he managed to publish his attack on the poet not in Holland, after all, but in France itself: it was included in the first volume of his notorious De l'Usage des romans which was printed clandestinely in Rouen with a false 'Amsterdam' colophon early in 1734.²¹⁶ Mathieu Marais remarked on seeing the piece: 'cet homme cherche à être enfermé'.²¹⁷ Rousseau did not himself openly respond to the fait accompli, but his correspondent de Lasseré in Paris sought to avenge his name through the Jesuits with whom he was friendly, particularly fathers Brumoy and Rouillé, the latter being at that time director of the Mémoires de Trévoux.²¹⁸ The fathers were deeply sympathetic to Rousseau, whom they had hoped to see recalled to France as the great Christian poet who would oppose Voltaire.²¹⁹ They agreed to publish some sort of counter-attack on Lenglet, which would in any case be

consistent with the severe onslaught they had made on his Méthode pour étudier l'histoire as recently as 1730: to that effect Brossette was asked to send them a copy of the letter which the Lieutenant de Police had exacted from Lenglet two years previously. In his accompanying letter Brossette pointed out to them that although Lenglet had removed his signature from the satire, nonetheless he, Brossette, was still implicated:

Il n'a rien changé, dit-on, dans le corps de l'ouvrage, où il me fait parler directement et sous le personnage de commentateur de Régnier, en adressant par ma bouche à M. Rousseau, qui est de mes amis, les infamies les plus atroces.²²⁰

When the Jesuits' riposte came it took the form of a highly reprobatory critique of De l'Usage des romans, with only a brief reference directly to the Rousseau affair:²²¹ no doubt a degree of caution was necessary in defending a writer who had been expelled for offending powerful interests at court.

The last word was however left to Rousseau: in 1736 he published an attack on Voltaire in the Bibliothèque française, and took advantage of the occasion to express his contempt for Lenglet:

Mr. Despreaux dont l'exemple sera toujours ma regle, m'a appris par son indifférence pour les invectives des Pradons, des Bonnacorse et des Cotins, à mépriser celles des Lenglets, des Gacons et des Voltaires,²²²

and he worked the same sentiments into a mock epitaph for himself:

De cet auteur noirci d'un crayon si malin,
Passant, veux-tu savoir quel fut le caractère?
Il avait pour amis D'Ussé, Brumoy, Rollin;
Pour ennemis, Gacon, Lenglet, Saurin, Voltaire.²²³

One may conclude that public opinion, or at least that of the learned robe circles typified by Marais and Bouhier, was largely unsympathetic to the abbé throughout the affair, and particularly condemnatory of his conduct towards Brossette, which was totally indefensible;²²⁴ the only

evidence which could explain, if not excuse Lenglet's behaviour towards Rousseau was locked away in the archives of the Affaires Etrangères. The poet was free to play 'le beau rôle' throughout.

As to Lenglet's edition of the Satires et autres oeuvres de Régnier²²⁵ the printing was not completed, as we have seen, until the end of 1733. Lenglet must have felt fairly confident at this stage that he would have no further problems with the authorities in Holland, but in January 1734 J.-B. Rousseau wrote from Brussels to Brossette with the following surprising news:

Sur l'examen ordonné par les magistrats de la ville d'Amsterdam des nouvelles notes sur Régnier, indépendamment du retranchement qui avait déjà été fait de ce qui vous regardait personnellement, le reste avait été trouvé si détestable et si rempli de choses contraires à l'honnêteté et à la pudeur, que le livre avait été supprimé et ce qui en était déjà imprimé mis au pilon.²²⁶

One must however doubt the accuracy of Rousseau's information, firstly because it suggests that the printing was never finished, which is clearly untrue, and secondly that all the printed copies were destroyed, which is again belied by the number of copies still extant. Very probably the affair had been greatly exaggerated at second hand; there may have been some seizure of completed copies by the authorities in Amsterdam, but a significant part of the edition escaped this fate, having, very likely, been already removed from the printer's premises for binding and distribution.

Lenglet's edition was closely based on that of Brossette, but with a large number of additions to the preface and notes, and a new category of poems by contemporaries of Régnier, or which concern the poet himself; the abbé's additions were mainly of a highly satirical and licentious nature. Brossette had good grounds for complaint, for

Lenglet deliberately tried to convince his reader that the former was the editor of this 'second edition' and of the notes it contains. He unscrupulously inserted statements such as the following into

Brossette's original Preface:

Je suis fâché pour ceux qui ont acheté ma première Edition, qu'une revûe que j'ai faite sur mon travail, m'ait engagé à augmenter si considérablement mes observations; mais des faits historiques, qui se présentent continuellement, pouvaient-ils être impunément négligés? Quelques pensées libres, qui m'ont égayé moi-même le premier, et de nouvelles découvertes des Poésies de notre Auteur, m'ont obligé comme malgré moi à redoubler mon attention. Je suis étonné de n'avoir pas fait plutôt ces découvertes, puisque la plupart sont tirées du Cabinet Satirique, Livre assez commun; mais je sens bien par là qu'on ne s'avise jamais de tout.²²⁷

None of this in the least resembles the style of the serious and scholarly Brossette; moreover we can easily recognise the abbé's interest in the Cabinet which we have seen he had himself published c. 1720.²²⁸ Michault rightly wondered why Lenglet should have chosen to reprint Brossette's edition such a short time after its original publication;²²⁹ he supposed that it was 'L'envie de dire de jolies choses, de faire parade d'érudition, de lecture et d'esprit, qui a engagé l'Abbé Lenglet à éclaircir un Texte licencieux par des Notes et des citations encore plus licencieuses'.²³⁰ He failed to mention the financial rewards which must have accrued from the illegal distribution of such editions in France, where there was a public avid to receive them. Unfortunately, the periodical press in general seems to have retained a strict silence in relation to this work, as it did on the subject of the Cabinet satyrique.

One of the main attractions of Lenglet's edition would appear to have been its sumptuous presentation with red-bordered pages: some copies were printed on papier impérial of folio size, such as that bought by De Boze, the censor of Lenglet's 1729 edition of the Méthode pour

étudier l'histoire.²³¹ Lenglet was very interested in the material presentation of those books which he negotiated directly with the printers, as was the case on this occasion.²³² This was a procedure which he would have liked to use more often, and attempted to use in France in face of the opposition from the Compagnie des libraires.²³³ His dislike and suspicion of most of the Parisian libraires was intense: in a manuscript note to his Bibliothèque des romans, written precisely in the 1730's, having praised the honesty of a seventeenth-century publisher he added the remark:

Il n'en est pas de meme de ses autres confreres de Paris, a peine dans trois cents [vous] en trouverez trois ou quatre honnetes gens. Je ne dis rien des autres; il est defendu de medire.²³⁴

An apologia for the novel

Scepticism, licentiousness, the deliberate pursuit of a succès de scandale, these features were not confined to Lenglet's 'foreign' editions: in fact they reach their apogée in his most original and enduring work, that treatise De l'Usage des romans which was published surreptitiously in France.²³⁵ We have seen that it was put on sale early in 1734,²³⁶ but Lenglet had in fact been working on it for some time: once again he tells us that it was the fruit of his long voyage to the Bastille and Vincennes, from March 1724 to June 1726.²³⁷ Those years between the time when Lenglet first started working on De l'Usage des romans and its publication were extremely fruitful in the development of the French novel; these were the years when what Georges May has called 'Le Dilemme du roman' was forced into the consciousness of

novelists and critics, the former trying to steer their way between the twin perils of 'invraisemblance' and 'immoralisme' with which they were continually reproached by the latter, and avoid the censure of the government authorities. May comments:

Si la grande colère des ennemis du roman s'explique bien en partie par l'audace croissante du réalisme caractérisant les romans des années 30, il faut observer aussi qu'un autre facteur, de nature différente, venait s'ajouter à cette audace et l'aggraver: le nombre grandissant des romans qui paraissaient alors. Celui-ci était tel qu'il fallait bien supposer - et déplorer- un goût parallèlement grandissant de la part du public pour ce genre de lecture; sans quoi comment s'expliquer l'ardeur croissante des libraires à publier tant de romans? ²³⁸

Under this rising pressure were produced many of what posterity judged to be the greatest novels of the eighteenth century; the bibliography published by Silas Paul Jones, A List of French Prose Fiction from 1700 to 1750, shows that the six years from 1731-36 saw the publication of over twice the number of new French novels (129) than the preceding six years (51), ²³⁹ and among these one may note titles such as La Vie de Marianne (1731), Le Philosophe anglois, ou Histoire de Monsieur Cleveland (1731-39), Le Paysan parvenu (1734-36), Le Doyen de Killerine (1735-40), as well as innumerable other novels popular among contemporaries, if now neglected. The publication of Lenglet's work can be seen in many ways as another response to this pressure, an audacious declaration of war on the enemies of the genre. In one of the strangest of all his prefaces he tells us that his situation at the time of writing largely explains the nature of the work:

...Il y a plusieurs contradictions dans mon Ouvrage, même dès le premier Chapitre. J'ai hasardé certaines choses, mais non pas des faits. Je me suis laissé aller à quelques bizarreries; peut-être un jour les regardera-t'on comme des choses bien raisonnables, si l'on n'a soin de les reprendre de bonne-heure: enfin j'ai fait fleche de tout bois. C'en seroit assez pour me desoler si j'ambitionnois la gloire d'être Auteur dans les formes.

Je sçai bien cependant à quoi tiennent mes contradictions: je n'ai pas fait mon Ouvrage en un jour; et comme heureusement mon esprit

n'est pas tous les jours monté sur le même ton, je travaillois au jour la journée, sans trop m'embarasser le matin de ce que j'avois écrit la veille: et je crois que c'est-là comme on doit faire ces sortes d'ouvrages, sans quoi ils ne valent rien. Tous les gens tirez et empesés sont d'ennuyeux personnages: c'est ce que j'ai évité. J'ai encore à dire que je n'ai travaillé que de mémoire: je n'ai vérifié mes citations qu'au retour de mon Voyage.²⁴⁰

With a type of involution of mind which characterises much of his life and work, he goes on to say that he could equally well take sides with those who criticise him and say he has gone too far in his praise of novels, as with those who find the work good, well-written and reasonable:²⁴¹ this is perhaps the clearest expression we find in his writings of that self-negating tendency which enabled him on so many occasions to take both sides in the same argument, even to the point of writing a reply to this very treatise, published within a year of De l'Usage.

The first volume contains Lenglet's defence of novels in seven chapters; he takes as his starting-point the paradox that novels have been almost universally condemned, yet a large number of people read them:

Toutes ces déclamations leur servent de relief. Il faut qu'on y trouve bien de l'agrément, puisqu'on a fait tout ce qu'on a pû pour les interdire: car c'est un régal pour certains Bigots de proscrire tout ce qui peut satisfaire l'esprit et l'imagination; et c'est aussi le régal de la plupart des hommes de ne rien faire de tout ce que ceux-là prescrivent.²⁴²

He himself would never have developed a taste for such literature had his interest not been whetted by warnings of their pernicious nature:

Mais j'ai voulu voir ce que c'étoit que ces ouvrages si contraires à la pureté du coeur, si fatales à l'esprit de vérité, si dangereux pour les moeurs; et je ne les ai pas trouvés à beaucoup près si mauvais qu'on me l'avoit dit, peut-être parce que je suis bien tombé. Ceux que j'ai lus ont réjoui mon imagination, ils m'ont diverti sans risque et sans péril. Ce n'est pas peu; et comme j'aime assez mon imagination pour lui rendre tous les services qui sont en mon pouvoir, j'ai continué à les lire, j'ai continué à les goûter, et j'en suis toujours agréablement sorti.²⁴³

Lenglet refutes the accusations made against novels, at once moral and aesthetic, on a number of heads.²⁴⁴ Firstly, he points to a certain relationship with the classical epic poems so much beloved of those educationalists who prize the anciens above all modern literature; but, he remarks, using an argument commonplace among the modernes, these are often far more 'dangerous' reading for young people than are modern novels because of the suspect morality of their heroes and gods:

Hé, que nos beaux Romans ne sont-ils en Vers Grecs ou Latins, on les regarderoit comme les oracles de la belle littérature. C'est-là qu'on iroit puiser les caracteres du Héroïsme; on les proposeroit comme la source du grand et du sublime dans les moeurs, aussi-bien que dans la maniere de penser et d'agir; mais ils ont le malheur d'être en françois.²⁴⁵

Another major argument which he develops, in response to the debate on moralism versus realism in the novel, opposes 'les Romans' to 'l'Histoire'.²⁴⁶ The opinion was becoming prevalent since the late seventeenth century that historical facts are uncertain and quasi-impossible to prove; therefore, Lenglet says, it is preferable to read novels which one knows, at the outset, not to be necessarily based on real fact at all.²⁴⁷ Moreover, he claims that novels can be morally more edifying reading than history:

On ne sçauroit donc desavoüer que l'Histoire ne livre de terribles assauts aux bonnes moeurs, lorsqu'on y voit des Tirans mourir tranquillement dans leurs lits; des Rois vertueux porter leurs têtes sur un échafaut, ou périr comme devoit faire un mauvais Prince; un Caligula et bien d'autres gens de même étoffe faire impunément leur plaisir d'un inceste: les obscenités, les impuretés mêmes les plus affreuses paroître en triomphe jusques dans l'Histoire de nos derniers Régnes, comme on voit en Daubigné et Dupleix. Quelle instruction peut-on tirer de tant de turpitudes? Il est vrai que pour couvrir tout ce bel étalage de Princes, qui se deshonnorent de tout sens, et de Princesses qui se livrent joyeusement à la discrétion d'une douzaine de galans qui ne s'y épargnent pas; on dit que l'Histoire est le Portrait de la misere humaine. C'est le mal que j'y trouve; au lieu que dans le Roman

le Prince vicieux, où le Roi Tiran périt toujours comme son crime le demande. Et quand vous lisez le Portrait des foiblesses humaines et les desordres de l'amour dans Me de Ville-Dieu, avec quelle sagesse n'êtes-vous pas conduit dans ces secrets détours connus seulement de la plus ardente passion; et quel dégoût cependant n'y inspire-t-on pas pour les excès blamables? ²⁴⁸

This was a common argument at the time among theoreticians of the novel, and even used by the novelists themselves to lend their works respectability, though the increasing realism of the best novels of the period directly contradicts the theory. ²⁴⁹ Finally, in a passage which had been censored in his Méthode pour étudier l'histoire, ²⁵⁰ he tells us that his main reason for preferring novels to history is the important rôle which women play in them and which the history books have denied them; this, he declares, is totally unjustified:

On ne sçauroit disconvenir que le Sexe ne fasse plus de la moitié du monde raisonnable, et qu'il ne soit la portion la plus essentielle de toutes les Cours: Mais j'ose encore assurer qu'il a souvent dans les grandes affaires plus de part que les Ministres mêmes. ²⁵¹

Thus despite the fact that novels are not based on verifiable fact, they are nevertheless more truly illuminating about the workings of society than the partial histories available:

Hé bien je sçai que tout en est faux, plus faux même qu'on ne le pense encore; mais rien n'est plus vraisemblable, et c'en est assez pour mon instruction. ²⁵²

The only intellectual certitude one may have in human affairs is therefore based on a concept of 'le vraisemblable' as opposed to 'le vrai'; the evolution of this concept throughout the century would make an interesting study.

Other chapters are devoted to the 'rules' to be observed in writing novels. Lenglet asserts that the author must be careful not to offend religion, morality, or the king; he must choose only 'noble' subjects, and concentrate on forming the intellect and moral sense of the reader,

for the novel exists 'pour instruire autant que pour récréer'.²⁵⁴ On one level of discourse Lenglet appears to be highly traditionalist in his approach; he quotes copiously from Daniel Huet's De l'Origine des romans (1670), and many of his affirmations, like that concerning the noble origins of the hero, are based on a relegation of the novel to the realm of poetry rather than that of history.²⁵⁵ But the real originality and unorthodoxy of the text defines itself in opposition to such arguments: as MM. Oudart and Sgard have underlined, Lenglet consistently affirms, indeed celebrates the pleasures of novel-reading, independent of all moral and pedagogic considerations.²⁵⁶ He grants a new validity to imagination:

L'Imagination n'est plus une puissance trompeuse mais un besoin fondamental qu'il faut 'satisfaire', 'réjouir', 'aimer': '...comme j'aime assez mon imagination pour lui rendre tous les services qui sont en mon pouvoir, j'ai continué à les lire' écrit-il à propos des romans (p.5). Il admet parfaitement que le roman soit 'le pays des rêveries et des fables', que tout y soit mensonge, mais tous ces mensonges lui apparaissent comme des figures du désir, qui est vrai. Et c'est pourquoi le roman ne peut nous éclairer que sur l'amour. C'est là le thème central de son livre, et il le développe avec l'enthousiasme d'un libertin, disciple de Théophile.²⁵⁷

A new and efficacious pedagogy must accept the attraction which such works hold for young people, rather than trying to suppress it, and use it to teach them 'la vertu d'amour'.²⁵⁸ Moreover, Lenglet expands his analysis of the advantages of novel-reading to persons of all age groups; he even attempts a comparative analysis of the novels of different countries and periods, and suggests reasons why they did not flourish in some societies.²⁵⁹ Thus the roman is imposed on the reader's consciousness as a necessary and universal phenomenon, whose substantiality would be given further corroboration by the major work of bibliography which was to form the second volume of De l'Usage.

Lenglet's treatment of his material was unorthodox, not to say

scandalous, in other more evident ways. He uses his discussions of the positive moral qualities portrayed by some novels to recount at length other less edifying examples; his remarks on the important rôle played by women in public affairs leads to a rapturous appreciation of extra-marital sexual relations; his enumeration of the transgressions to be avoided by novel-writers gives him an opportunity to recount indulgently examples of the kind of thing he has in mind. As Lenglet admits in the preface he was determined to amuse himself,²⁶⁰ and this he did in the best libertin tradition at the expense of Jesuits, Jansenists, Protestants, monks and fellow writers who in turn are made the butts of his satiric humour. The novelists who were struggling for the recognition of their art against the opposition of the dévots can scarcely have thanked him for thus confirming many people's worst suspicions about the disastrous moral effects of novel-reading! Also included in this first volume are the 'Pièces curieuses sur le poète Rousseau' already discussed above.

The second volume is entitled Bibliothèque des romans, and is often mentioned by contemporaries as a work in its own right: it was the first major bibliography in the field, where Lenglet turned his experience and knowledge of books to an area which had not hitherto been considered serious enough to warrant such a concerted effort. It was, he tells us in his preface to the second volume, 'le fruit de beaucoup de recherches. Le travail en a été d'autant plus grand, que personne ne m'avait devancé dans ce dessein'. As to the reproaches of those who consider such an activity to be frivolous, or even dangerous, Lenglet simply rejects the relevance of any such value-judgements to what he sees as an activity of historical documentation:

Je sçai ce qu'on dira de cette seconde Partie, que c'est un amas de Livres inutiles, dont quelques-uns mêmes sont pernicioeux. Je ne l'ignore pas; mais je les donne pour tels: tout ce que je puis dire de plus modéré en leur faveur, est que ce sont des Livres d'amusemens, et souvent il est bon de s'amuser. Cependant qui les sçauroit bien prendre ne les trouveroit pas tout-à-fait inutiles.

He goes on to suggest, in an interesting development, how the study of novels can help us to understand peoples of other times and other countries; he claims that the kind of material documentation he has assembled enables one to see the cross-influences between cultures in their true perspective, as for example in the case of the origins of the 'Livres de Chevalerie'.²⁶¹ He does not claim however that his work is totally comprehensive; he had not, for example, included original German novels, for he received information on them from a friend too late to include it in the body of the work: there is only a short note on them in the 'Avertissement'.²⁶² Likewise he has included few English, and no Dutch novels, his reason being, ostensibly, that there were none, but one suspects it is again because he was not familiar enough with the languages, or did not have easy access to the material; the Italian and Spanish novels are better represented for the opposite reasons.²⁶³ Many of the items in the bibliography are annotated by Lenglet in his usual erratic style, ranging from interesting historical and bibliographical information to licentious comments and attacks on personal enemies.²⁶⁴

The imprint on the title-page of De l'Usage des romans claims that it was published 'A Amsterdam, chez la Veuve de Poilras', and indeed many printing features in the book - the red and black title-page, the catch-words on every page, the arabic numerals in the signature - do substantiate the claim that the book is of foreign, if not precisely Dutch origin.²⁶⁵ However, we have external evidence that the work was in fact printed in

Rouen; this is a good indication of the lengths to which publishers of clandestine editions would go in their attempts to pass their works off as being printed abroad,²⁶⁶ largely, no doubt, to throw the French authorities off their scent, but also, it would seem, to facilitate distribution of the volumes by booksellers in the supposed country of origin. This last is asserted by a bookseller named Barillot who wrote to Claude Brossette on 5th March 1734, telling him the l'Usage des romans had not yet appeared in publishing circles in Paris, but that he had managed to procure a copy through a 'soldat aux gardes', and stating authoritatively:

Il a été imprimé à Rouen chez Viret, sous le nom d'Amsterdam. J'ai vu sur la Gazette de Hollande cet ouvrage annoncé comme imprimé à Amsterdam: c'est pour faire passer l'édition de France. Je ne crois pas qu'en cette ville-là on osât imprimer ni même débiter la lettre à M. l'Ambassadeur.²⁶⁷

The Rouen origin is substantiated by Déon de Beaumont, who got much of his information from Lenglet's sister; moreover he tells us that a libraire from that city who was detained in the Bastille (for what specific transgression he does not say) assured the Lieutenant de Police, Hérault, that Lenglet was the author of the work. Lenglet was called to account for himself, but was able to tell the Lieutenant that he was in fact writing a refutation of that same work, and could not therefore be its author!²⁶⁸ The Lieutenant can hardly have been fooled by this ploy, for Lenglet was generally known to be the author; he had already used the same pseudonym 'Gordon de Percel' in the Marot edition. However it would seem that the authorities were prepared to turn a blind eye on this occasion, much to the surprise of the Président Bouhier who remarked on 24th April:

Tout le monde court à Paris après deux livres, qui devraient en bonne police faire enfermer leurs auteurs, l'un est de l'abbé

Lenglet sous le titre, De l'usage des romans et l'autre est intitulé Lettres philosophiques, qu'on assure être de Voltaire.²⁶⁹

Lenglet, however, suffered little harassment from them: Marais remarked in a letter to Bouhier on 12th April that 'L'auteur se promène dans les vûes',²⁷⁰ it was left to the Jesuits to pick up the gauntlet which Lenglet had flung at the dévot establishment. Nonetheless the distribution of the work itself was slow in Paris. We have seen that Barillot, himself a bookseller, found it impossible to procure a copy through normal channels in early March. On 13th April the Président Bouhier in Dijon wrote to Mathieu Marais:

Nous n'avons point encore le livre de l'usage des Romans. On mande qu'à Paris même on a peine à l'avoir. J'en suis très curieux, je l'avoue,²⁷¹

and Marais himself on the 31st March had only seen the first volume.²⁷²

It eventually did penetrate the Parisian market, where it was much talked about in the following months, but the demand does seem to have constantly outstripped the supply: already on the 12th April Marais remarked that 'L'Usage des Romans devient rare',²⁷³ and even in 1755 Déon de Beaumont asserted that 'cet ouvrage est très-rare'.²⁷⁴

Reactions to Lenglet's work were very mixed from the start: people were intrigued, although most of the 'learned' public were careful to mark their distances from this type of publication. We find the first reactions in the correspondence of the scholarly magistrate Bouhier, and that of Mathieu Marais deserves to be quoted at length:

Mais avez-vous l'Usage des Romans ce livre si singulier, si plein d'esprit, de malice, d'impiété, de bizarreries, d'obscénité, de volupté, de galanterie, d'ironie, de mépris de l'histoire, d'amour pour les femmes, d'erudition, et enfin d'un dessein si nouveau qu'on le prendrait pour un autre Rabelais, s'il n'avoit dit du mal de Rabelais. Ce qu'il dit sur la Papesse Jeanne,²⁷⁵ et sur la dispute de M. de Meaux et de M. de Cambray n'a point été dit ny pensé.²⁷⁶ L'Education par Romans est digne de luy, et c'est original de la conduire jusqu'à la vieillesse qu'il veut faire radoter apparemment.

[...] Il y a un 2e tome que je n'ay pas encor vû et qui est un Catalogue de tous les romans avec quelques petits jugemens mordans comme il a fait sur les historiens et sur les imprimeurs mesme, dont il dit qu'un étoit cocu. Vous reconnoissez bien a tout cela Mr L'abbé Lenglet du fresnoy: il a dit-on 72 ans, l'air crasseux, pedant et tres vilain. Et voila le heros de la galanterie et des romans, et le pervertisseur des moeurs;²⁷⁷

He added on a further occasion:

L'auteur est un fou, et le livre n'est pas si fou je ne scay si vous m'entendez.²⁷⁸

These words are echoed closely by Bouhier in his reply of 6th April, in which he admits that he is 'fort curieux' about the new work, but adding on its author:

C'est une espece de fou, qui ne laisse pas d'amuser. Voila les Ecrivains au goût du siècle.²⁷⁹

Marais' attitude to Lenglet is typical of that of the orthodox scholars as manifested on innumerable occasions. They were alternately amused, interested, scandalised by his productions; above all they were happy to be able to use his expertise, while at the same time protecting their own image of themselves by categorising him as a 'fou', a 'monstre', a man with no particular place in society and patently not one of themselves. They could then happily vilify him and his works while being the first to the bookshops to buy them.

There were a number of reviews published by the periodical press;²⁸⁰ no less than two appeared in the abbé Goujet's Bibliothèque française. The first of these was a short notice, probably by Goujet himself: he was evidently well informed as to the identity of the real author, and showed his disdain for Lenglet's satirical attacks on persons such as Rousseau. Nonetheless the tone was guardedly approbatory:

Il y a d'excellentes choses, mais il n'est pas toujours sûr de s'en rapporter à son exactitude et à ses jugemens.²⁸¹

The second, longer review by an anonymous correspondent is more typical

of the published reactions. He begins by exposing the real author of the piece as the 'Abbé L*** du F**', and points out that the tone of the whole work is inconsistent with his clerical calling:

Aparement [...] que M. l'Abbé ennuyé du caractère que son Etat l'oblige naturellement de soutenir, a voulu l'égayer un peu, et qu'il a cru qu'en changeant de nom il pouvoit en sûreté de conscience changer de morale. 282

There follows a satirical account of a number of Lenglet's arguments in favour of novels, the author's tacit assumption throughout being that novel-reading is a useless, if not harmful activity. However, the most substantial criticisms are in the realm of 'morality' - a rejection of Lenglet's 'obscénités' and of his personal attacks on other writers.

The author finishes with a malicious flourish:

Je plains Mr. Gordon, si Mr. d'Exilles est vindicatif; car il n'a seulement qu'à mettre Mr. Rousseau dans ses intérêts en lui montrant son Eloge historique inseré dans le livre de Mr. Gordon, et dès lors je vous livre celui-ci fort embarrassé de sa contenance: gare les Couplets, et le Pour et Contre. 283

J.B. Michault in his note on De l'Usage des romans summed up the 'public' responses to the work:

L'Usage des Romans, sans avoir été généralement approuvé, fut reçu par les uns avec quelque indulgence, et proscrit par les autres comme un Ouvrage scandaleux 284

- the latter remark referring no doubt to the Jesuit critiques, which we will consider below. But undoubtedly the 'indulgence' was far greater than was commonly admitted in the press, and the exceptionally outspoken notice on Lenglet's book published in Prévost's Pour et contre was probably a better indication of the readership's reaction:

Le nouveau Livre intitulé de l'Usage des Romans, par M. le Chevalier Gordon de Percel, est amusant et écrit avec beaucoup de feu et de liberté. Aussi est-il fort couru, et on le lit avec avidité. 285

The Bibliothèque des romans was often treated as a separate entity,

and was subjected to some severe criticisms on scholarly grounds. It will be remembered that Lenglet in his Preface to the first volume assured the reader that he had worked 'que de memoire', and had only verified his citations on his return from his 'journey'; one suspects that he worked in a similar manner on the Bibliothèque, for the titles of the books he names are often inaccurate.²⁸⁶ It is probable that Lenglet, who, as we have seen, traded regularly in old books, and spent much of his time in libraries, had at some time seen copies of many of the novels which he lists, and with his phenomenal memory could recall them 'à peu près'.²⁸⁷ Thus a great effort of reconstitution would be necessary in many cases to discover the true title from the version which Lenglet gives; moreover, there is no guarantee that he had actually read the works he describes, and so he made glaring errors in his classification. Added to this were the obvious areas of inadequacy which I have mentioned above. These were the main reproaches made by contemporary critics; one can again quote Michault who qualifies the bibliography as 'superficiel et imparfait', continuing:

Ceux qui ont vu la riche Collection des Ouvrages Erotiques, faite par M. le Duc de la Valliere, sont convaincus que l'Abbé Lenglet avoit à peine connu la moitié des Morceaux Romanesques dont il a voulu donner une notice complete. D'ailleurs, dans les Divisions Systématiques de cette Bibliothèque, il a fait des fautes si grossieres, qu'on juge aisément qu'il n'avoit jamais vu la plupart des Romans dont il parle.²⁸⁸

Much more serious in its tones than any of the former commentaries was the reaction to Lenglet's work on the part of the Jesuit editors of the Trévoux journal. We have already seen that the Rousseau affair provided at least part of the impetus for the Jesuits' prompt attack: the first announcement of this appeared as early as February 1734,²⁸⁹ the reverend journalists being already remarkably well-informed as to the

contents of the impending publication. The attack again takes a moral tone:

S'il étoit vrai, comme on l'assure, qu'un Catholique Romain fût pere de cette monstrueuse production, c'est à l'école de Cythere et de l'Epicurisme le plus grossier qu'il en a formé le plan. Dans la morale cynique qu'il veut établir sur les ruines de la pudeur, et de la probité, on ne reconnaît point la Religion de l'Ecrivain, et encore moins dans le nouveau genre d'Heroïsme qu'il tâche de substituer à celui des Aléxandres et des Césars.²⁹⁰

The Jesuit authors also made their support for Rousseau explicit.²⁹¹

The full review promised in this announcement appeared in the following April: it is a virulent attack on the three grounds of 'l'impiété, la médisance et l'obscénité'.²⁹² The reverend fathers start from the assumption that novels are, by their nature, a malevolent influence in society:

Passons lui toutes ses regles, à condition qu'il nous en passera une cinquième qu'il a oubliée: c'est qu'après avoir bien composé et bien travaillé un beau Roman, suivant toutes ses magnifiques regles, il faut le jetter au feu. Cette décision est incontestable, dumoins pour plus des trois quarts et demi de ces ouvrages, dont tout le fruit est, comme on a déjà remarqué il y a plusieurs années dans ces Memoires, de laisser dans le coeur et l'esprit une impression de tendresse, un penchant pour la galanterie, un goût pour l'intrigue, qui dans les jeunes personnes étouffe tout sentiment de pieté et de pudeur austere.²⁹³

Nonetheless this review bases itself on a mixture of moral and aesthetic values, as can be seen from its introductory paragraphs:

Chaque Ecrivain a pour ainsi dire son coin et sa marque, qui le fait distinguer. Ainsi, qu'il paroisse un Ouvrage comme celui-ci plein de mauvais raisonnemens, et de contradictions, d'une érudition puisée dans les sources les plus décriées, de traits injurieux, de médisances atroces, où l'on nomme les personnes par leur nom sans aucun égard à la bienséance ni aux bonnes moeurs; de saillies pleines d'impieté, qui font frémir la Religion; de discours pleins d'indécence, qui font rougir la pudeur: joignez à tout cela une maniere d'écrire, soi disant libre et enjouée, mais froide et plate, sans suite, sans ordre, sans liaison, confondant pêle mèle le sacré et le profane, le vrai et le faux, le serieux et le burlesque; Voilà, dira-t'on infailliblement un Ouvrage de***, c'est là son coin et sa marque.²⁹⁴

The author finds ample fuel for his attack in Lenglet's burlesque preface alone, of which he has no difficulty in highlighting the extra-

ordinary convolution:

Ainsi M.*** par un privilege, qui lui est particulier, trouve le moyen de penser indifferemment le pour et le contre.²⁹⁵

The rest of his commentary stresses Lenglet's unorthodoxy in the most vituperative terms: love and virtue are incompatible, and Lenglet's scandalous maxims which suggest otherwise 'meriteroient un châtement exemplaire'.²⁹⁶ Only a madman could consider putting such works in the hands of children, who would be necessarily corrupted by them. The Jesuit concludes his analysis with a declaration of war on novels:

Il y auroit ici un beau feu de joye à faire, à commencer par le livre dont nous venons de rendre compte. Mais c'est l'affaire des Magistrats.²⁹⁷

A few paragraphs at the end of this review are devoted if not to a defense of Rousseau, for we are told this will come from his own pen, at least to a declaration of solidarity with him and an exposition of Lenglet's attempted usurpation of Brossette's name.²⁹⁸ This was obviously a result of the contacts between Rousseau's friends and the directors of the Mémoires referred to above,²⁹⁹ although the article was actually written by Guillaume Hyacinthe Bougeant S.J.³⁰⁰ His hostility, and that of his society, against Lenglet's work was not exhausted with the Trévoux reviews: MM. Sgard and Oudart suggest that the Jesuits, 'éclairés par l'Usage des romans sur la dimension, la modernité et l'influence pernicieuse du genre romanesque', thereafter mounted a consistent attack against the novel genre such as had been foreshadowed by some of the terms of the Bougeant article.³⁰¹ Their campaign, it is suggested, to which the Père Guillaume himself made a major contribution with a satirical answer to De l'Usage,³⁰² was a major factor in bringing about the proscription des romans which became effective in March 1737.³⁰³

One interesting article in Prévost's periodical, the Pour et contre, was written as a response to an extraordinarily vicious attack which Lenglet had made on the unfortunate abbé in his Bibliothèque, in three separate references to Prévost's works. The first, and least offensive, occurs in relation to the Mémoires et aventures d'un homme de qualité:

Ce Roman, qui est assez bien écrit, vient du P. Prevost alors Benedictin, et depuis Prosélite en Angleterre, en Hollande, à Bâle, et par tout ailleurs, où il fait de bons tours.³⁰⁴

The second remark follows the listing of Le Philosophe anglais, ou Histoire de M. de Cleveland:

L'Auteur de cet Ouvrage étoit ci-devant Benedictin; mais ne pouvant pas aisément pratiquer des Romans dans son Ordre, il a eu la bonté de se retirer en Angleterre; d'où on l'a chassé, parce qu'il en pratiquoit trop. Il s'est ensuite transporté en Hollande, où il a fait ce Livre; il avoit aussi entrepris la Traduction de l'Histoire de M. de Thou. Mais depuis il a eu l'honneur de faire banqueroute, s'est fait enlever par une jeune fille ou femme, est allé à Basle en Suisse, et de-là il en est décampé cette année 1733. parce que Mrs les Suisses, quoique bonnes gens, n'aiment pas à être trompés par de pareils personnages, qui ont la simplicité de se laisser attraper par des filles.³⁰⁵

The last and most offensive paragraph is contained in the 'Addition à la Bibliothèque des romans', where Lenglet listed the Suite des mémoires d'un homme de qualité, ou l'Histoire de Manon Lescot, and remarked:

On voit bien par ce Roman, qui vient encore de M. le Prevost ci-devant Benedictin, qu'il connoit un peu trop le bas peuple de Cithere. Quelle incroyable fécondité d'actions et de livres dans cet admirable personnage! On assure qu'ennuyé de vivre parmi les Réformez, il cherche à rentrer dans notre Communion. Après avoir été Soldat, puis Jesuite; Soldat pour la seconde fois et ensuite Jesuite; il s'est fait dérechef Soldat, puis Officier, Benedictin, enfin Réformé, Protestant ou Anglican. Qu'importe, je crois qu'il ne le sçait pas lui-même. Il voudroit aujourd'hui se faire Benedictin de Clugny, sans doute pour aller de-là jusqu'à Constantinople prêcher l'Alcoran et devenir Mufti, s'il se peut, et fixer ensuite sa Religion au Japon. Outre le nom de M. le Prevost, il prend encore celui de M. d'Exilles.³⁰⁶

Prévost, who was living in Holland until the latter part of 1734,³⁰⁷ seems to have had some difficulty ascertaining what Lenglet had written against him, but he finally published a reply in June/July 1734;³⁰⁸

though he did not name Lenglet, he obviously knew who was hiding behind the pseudonym of Gordon de Percel. The accusations made by Lenglet were particularly inauspicious for Prévost at this moment, for he was in the process of trying to negotiate a return to France; the public stigma of apostasy was obviously one he desperately wished to avoid, nor were the references to his love affairs likely to help towards his reintegration into the monastic life.³⁰⁹ Where the malicious abbé had managed to unearth the unfortunate Prévost's sordid, but normally well-kept secrets, is an interesting question, and suggests that he himself had some contacts with the 'bas peuple', if not 'du Cythère', at least of the literary world.

Prévost then, in his reply, felt obliged to make a public statement of his attachment to the 'Religion Chrétienne';³¹⁰ the rest of his article is, however, as J. Sgard has underlined, a masterpiece in ambiguity:

Il n'y propose qu'une toute petite partie des faits, auxquels il donne une apparence nécessaire et ordonnée; il minimise les incidents, fait de sa révolte de 1728 un 'petit mécontentement'; il joue avec virtuosité de l'euphémisme, de la litote, de la 'confession ingénue' et fait de sa phrase le reflet de l'âme qu'il prétend avoir.³¹¹

Prévost appeals to the emotions of his readers; while pleading partially guilty to the charges made against him, he is asking that one look beyond these unfortunate 'accidents' of life to the 'real' man, whose heart is always true, and that one judge him accordingly. This is precisely the kind of appeal the heroes of his novels make for the recognition of their own worth, and at which Des Grieux excels; Prévost himself warns his reader against their art on a number of occasions.³¹² Nevertheless the emotional appeal, the lofty tone of his article could not

but contrast favourably with the mean, vituperative nature of Lenglet's offending sallies.

In conclusion to his article Prévost lists the occasions on which he had dealings with 'M. de Percel', again adding 'Je laisse à juger au Public si elles ont dû m'attirer sa haine'.³¹³ In the first incident he recounts that while he was in Amsterdam in 1731 he was asked to edit Lenglet's Méthode pour étudier l'histoire, presumably for a projected pirate edition, cutting out 'toutes les inutilitez qui sont dans cet Ouvrage', and adding new material. He claims that he refused the job because he didn't wish to offend Lenglet; but wonders if the abbé had heard about his refusal, without being told the motive behind it.³¹⁴ The second event relates to Lenglet's edition of the works of Marot; as we have seen above, Prévost was approached by a person responsible for correcting the work, who asked his opinion on Lenglet's Preface.³¹⁵ Prévost tells us that he advised against publication on moral grounds, again pleading the simple honesty of his own reply to elicit the reader's sympathies.³¹⁶ Prévost does not appear to know whether the Preface was actually censored or not, but assumes that had Lenglet come to hear of his intervention he would not have been pleased. Lastly, when Prévost had undertaken to translate the Histoire de M. de Thou in association with the publishers Gosse and Neaulme in the Hague,³¹⁷ Lenglet wrote to the latter offering to contribute to the edition; Prévost, however, did not wish to accept the items offered, either because he had already procured them from another source, or he regarded them as irrelevant. Moreover he judged Lenglet's 'remarques' to be inexact, and his comments on the subject were forwarded to the abbé; Prévost, apparently, actually quoted and refuted one of Lenglet's remarks in a

note in the published edition.³¹⁸ Considering Lenglet's character we need not share Prévost's astonishment at his reaction to such a procedure; the revenge which he unfailingly took was so often disproportionate to the slight. Any one of the reasons suggested by Prévost would have sufficed to provoke Lenglet's bitterness; the last quoted may well have been the immediate precipitate, for in a manuscript note on his own copy of the Bibliothèque des romans, where he had listed Le Philosophe anglois and remarked that the same author had translated the Histoire de M. de Thou, he added the qualification 'livre fort au dessus de sa portée'.³¹⁹

We have already seen some manifestations of the public interest aroused by De l'Usage des romans; we find a further indication of its popularity in the statistics compiled by Daniel Mornet based on a study of the catalogues of 500 private libraries of the eighteenth century.³²⁰ He found copies of the work listed in 102 of the 500 catalogues examined, thus placing it eighteenth in the order of relative frequency of all the works catalogued. Although these figures have no absolute value, they are sufficient to raise the question as to why a work so obviously saleable was never republished. Lenglet must have contemplated a second edition, for there is a copy of the Bibliothèque des romans preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale, corrected and augmented in his own hand, with an obvious view to publication.³²¹ It contains notes on new novels published up to 1739. Moreover, as early as 1734 the Bibliothèque française announced that 'Mr. Gordon va faire imprimer un troisième volume, où il traitera en détail les divers genres de Roman et y joindra un Supplement au Catalogue'.³²² But no supplement or second edition ever appeared;

whether Lenglet feared further complications with the censorship authorities, or whether the publishers for some reason regarded the work as a poor risk, it is impossible to say with any certainty.³²³

However, two other publications directly related to L'Usage des romans were soon to appear in the bookshops: the first was the satirical allegory in novel form by the Jesuit G. H. Bougeant. This work, entitled Voyage merveilleux du Prince Fan-Férédin dans la Romancie; contenant plusieurs observations historiques, géographiques, physiques, critiques et morales,³²⁴ recounts the story of a young prince who is so attracted by the novels which his mother, in accordance with Lenglet's principles, gives him to read, that he sets off to find the 'pays de Romancie', which country he describes in long and boring detail. The satire is heavy-handed and unimaginative, as for example the passage where he describes the Bibliothèque des romans:

Expliquez-moi [...] ce que c'est que ce Bâtiment singulier que j'apperois dans cette place publique. C'est, me répondit-il, un Bâtiment où l'on garde les Archives de la Romancie; assez mauvais ouvrage, comme vous voyez. Le Portail qui est aussi grand que le corps même du Bâtiment, n'est qu'un assemblage bizarre où l'on ne voit ni méthode, ni principes, et qui choque le bon sens: aussi a-t-il révolté tous les esprits sensez. Le corps du Bâtiment ne vaut guères mieux; c'est un amas de pierres entassées les unes sur les autres sans goût, sans ordre ni liaison; mais on ne doit après tout rien attendre de mieux de la part de l'Entrepreneur. C'est un homme qui se donnoit auparavant dans le pays d'histoire pour un grand ouvrier, jusques-là qu'il faisoit la leçon à tous les autres, et qu'il s'étoit érigé en Censeur général; mais la forfanterie lui ayant mal réussi, il s'est jetté de désespoir dans la Romancie, où il n'a pû trouver d'autre moyen de subsister, que de s'y donner pour Architecte. C'est sur ce pied-là qu'il a été employé à construire le Bâtiment dont nous parlons; mais vous voyez par l'exécution, que le prétendu Architecte n'est qu'un médiocre Maçon.³²⁵

Michault qualified Bougeant's work as a 'triste et noire production... dont le tour ne parut point agréable, dont les idées n'étoient point riantes, dont la fiction n'amusa personne que lui-même'.³²⁶ Lenglet's

own comment in his manuscript notes was more favourable - he himself, we have already remarked, could be equally heavy-handed in his own satirical productions - and typically facetious:

Il y a du feu, et de l'esprit, et il a jugé à propos comme Jesuite, de critiquer le livre de l'Usage des Romans. J'en sçai la raison c'est qu'on y parle avec eloge de l'amour raisonnable des deux sexes. Mais l'auteur de fanferedin voudroit-il que je me fusse tourné d'un autre coté.³²⁷

Secondly appeared Lenglet's own refutation of 'Mr. Gordon's' work, entitled L'Histoire justifiée contre les romans, published in France, probably Paris, early in 1735, and reprinted in Amsterdam with the same date.³²⁸ We have already seen that Lenglet produced this work with the purpose of convincing the authorities that he was not responsible for L'Usage des romans, and it bears all the marks of a rushed and un-committed work. The critics were unmercifully scathing on both the subterfuge involved and the actual content of the work,³²⁹ and Lenglet certainly provoked their hilarity by declaring in his Avertissement:

Si l'Auteur de l'Usage des Romans avait daigné suivre mes avis, je lui aurais conseillé, ou de ne pas faire imprimer son Livre, ou de se former un tout autre plan sur une matière aussi délicate. Je ne doute pas qu'il ne me pardonne la liberté que je prends de m'expliquer ici avec quelque vivacité: mais il ne lui est pas défendu d'en agir de même avec moi. J'aurai pour lui à cet égard une condescendance égale à celle que j'exige de son amour pour la Vérité.

The abbé Desfontaines, writing in the Observations sur les écrits modernes, responded sarcastically:

Je crois que le pardon a été accordé aisément, et même d'avance; mais la permission qu'il donne à l'Auteur qu'il combat, d'user de represailles, ne seroit-elle point l'annonce de quelque réplique? Il seroit fort plaisant de voir M.L... et l'Auteur qu'il attaque continuer de donner au Public des Scenes de cette rare espece. Quoique j'aime que les Ecrivains Polemiques soient polis, je consentirois volontiers, pour la rareté du fait, que ceux-ci ne s'épargnassent point.³³⁰

On the content of the work it would be difficult to refute the critic in the Bibliothèque française who wrote:

Les sept premiers [articles] renferment un éloge assés trivial de l'Histoire. A parler franchement, bien des personnes auroient souhaitté que sur cet article Mr. L. du F. eût renvoyé les Lecteurs à sa Méthode d'étudier l'Histoire. Cet Ouvrage, comme on le sait, lui a fait honneur, et les louanges qu'on ne peut refuser à l'Histoire, y sont dispensées avec autant de goût que d'érudition; au lieu que dans l'Histoire Justifiée, on aperçoit un Auteur qui s'est, pour ainsi dire, négligé. On est tenté de croire que par respect et par tendresse pour Mr. Gordon de Percel, Mr. Lenglet du Fresnoy n'a pas voulu se servir de tous ses avantages; peu s'en faut même qu'on ne le soupçonne d'avoir lâchement trahi la cause dont il se dit l'Avocat, ³³¹

This view was echoed by Desfontaines who said that the chapters referred to above 'ne contiennent que des lieux communs et des choses très-vulgaires, touchant l'utilité de l'Histoire'.³³² That Lenglet's characteristic style was as clearly evident in the refutation as in the original offending work was cleverly underlined by the Bibliothèque française:

Le but principal de Mr. l. du F. est de persuader au Public qu'il n'est point Mr. le C. Gordon de Percel; et cependant on retrouve dans le Livre de Mr. Lenglet le stile de Mr. le Comte, sa méthode dans la distribution de sa matiere, ses digressions fréquentes et longues, son amour pour les citations, certain penchant pour la Satyre, et jusques à ce soin prudent d'enrichir son Livre de quelques Pièces curieuses, afin de donner un certain poids à l'Ouvrage. N'aura-t-on pas raison d'être un peu surpris, que deux Personnes affectent de paroître d'un esprit si différent, et se ressemblent en tant de choses? ³³³

The by now infamous characteristics of Lenglet's style were likewise pinpointed by the Père Bougeant, who once more took up his pen in the Mémoires de Trévoux to prove with heavy-handed irony that he was not fooled by Lenglet's subterfuge.³³⁴ The final word may be left to the author of a critique in the Journal littéraire, who admitted:

L'Usage des Romans amuse, la singularité des pensées, la liberté, l'enjouement du stile plait; l'Histoire justifiée est une source de baillemens. On seroit presque tenté de comparer le premier aux Lettres Provinciales, et le second aux Entretiens d'Eudoxe et de Cleanthe[...] On dira pourtant encore, qu'au libertinage près, on aimeroit mieux avoir écrit une seule page de l'Usage des Romans, que toute l'Histoire justifiée.³³⁵

It is surprising that this contrived and platitudinous work should have been reprinted in Holland (whether with or without the collaboration of the author we do not know), when l'Usage des romans had only one edition. Moreover, Lenglet himself borrowed several chapters from it to swell his Supplément à la Méthode pour étudier l'histoire published in 1739.³³⁶ His interest in the Maid of Orléans, to whom he devotes a long passage in Article VIII of his work, later developed into the Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc published shortly before his death: moreover, Lenglet appended to l'Histoire justifiée part of a manuscript treatise on the same subject by Guillaume Postel which he had found in the royal library. Indeed this and the other two 'Pièces' included at the back of the volume were perhaps the most valuable part of the publication in the eyes of many of the buyers.

From early 1734 it was rumoured that Lenglet was working on a new edition of Le Roman de la rose,³³⁷ which poem had been neglected from the time of Marot who had republished it in much 'updated' form; we have already seen that the abbé had possibly intended to publish the Roman as early as 1724 as part of the Coustelier collection. We have discussed the revival of interest in French works of the medieval period, which is again affirmed by Lenglet in his Preface:

Le goût de nos anciens poètes, qui s'est renouvelé depuis quelque temps, a donné lieu d'en réimprimer quelques-uns. On auroit dû commencer par celui-ci.³³⁸

Président Bouhier had been quick to note that Lenglet quoted the Roman 'à tout bout de champ' in his notes on Marot,³³⁹ and so when Lenglet in his Bibliothèque des romans, described a new edition of 1734 in the most approbatory tones³⁴⁰ speculation was rife as to whether he himself was the editor of the work, and what its quality would be.

Lenglet's chief boast in announcing his new edition was:

Elle est faite sur les plus anciennes Editions et non sur celle de Clement Marot, qui s'étoit avisé d'en changer le stile pour le rendre plus intelligible.³⁴¹

However, when the work did appear in June/July 1735³⁴² his editorial technique proved to be much less rigorous than one might have hoped for on the strength of this declaration. The 'Plan de cette Edition' in the 'Paris' edition contained the following description of his method:

J'ai revu le Texte sur diverses Editions et quelques Manuscrits. Je ne me suis pas accablé cependant par les uns ni par les autres; je hay trop ces Savantas, dont tout le sçavoir est de comparer des Manuscrits et de recueillir les fautes des Copistes, par le moyen desquelles ils jettent de l'incertitude sur les meilleurs Ecrivains de l'antiquité. C'est à quoi aboutissent toutes ces Variantes compilées avec tant de travail et avec si peu d'esprit par ces demi Savans, plus occupés des Commentaires que des textes de leurs Auteurs.

Cependant comme il y a en quelques Editions ou même dans un petit nombre de Manuscrits des differences utiles ou essentielles pour l'intelligence de cet Ouvrage, j'ai cru ne les devoir pas négliger. J'ai donc choisi une Edition connue et un Manuscrit de conséquence pour les comparer avec mon Edition et faire remarquer les changemens, qui ont été faits à ce Livre.³⁴³

The totally arbitrary nature of Lenglet's procedure as outlined here scarcely needs commenting; he makes no effort to justify his choice of text by indicating any criteria on which his judgement might have been based, other than that his sources were 'connues' and 'de conséquence'. Lionel Gossman states that Lenglet's edition in fact reproduced substantially the text of the Vérard edition of 1500, which in turn was based on a fifteenth-century manuscript;³⁴⁴ the 'corrections' were based on one manuscript which had belonged to the Chancelier Séguier, and which was conserved in the library at Saint-Germain-des-Prés.

But the degree of seriousness with which Lenglet regarded his editorial duties can best be judged from the fact that in two separate issues of

this edition the first 28 pages contained two very different states of the text;³⁴⁵ the abbé's sole purpose in making these major changes seems to have been to create the impression that the second issue was a completely different edition, and one for which he could not be held accountable. The need for this subterfuge arose because of problems with his Preface. He had written a long historical and biographical introduction to the poem,³⁴⁶ laced with his usual satirical and licentious gibes; he especially aimed his satire on this occasion at the religious orders, the Dominican and Franciscan friars, for whom he had always nourished a particular hatred. However, although the edition he first announced was to be published in Amsterdam,³⁴⁷ that which finally appeared was published in Paris, 'chez la Veuve Pissot', with the royal approbation et privilège. Lenglet's work had therefore been submitted to a censor, and either he had himself altered his Preface before submitting it, which is the most likely hypothesis, or he had been required by the censor to remove a significant amount of offensive material.³⁴⁸ However, the abbé had no intention of limiting himself to the orthodox state of the edition, and there was a separate issue made with a new title-page, purporting to be published 'à Amsterdam, chez Jean Fred. Bernard' (as had the French edition of L'Histoire justifiée). It contained the original state of the Preface, and 28 pages of the poem in an altered text; the rest of the volume was identical to the 'Pissot' edition, and came off the same presses. In other words the two 'editions' of Paris and Amsterdam are in fact only two separate issues of the same edition, both produced in Paris. The ease with which Lenglet switched from one version of the poem to another for reasons of expediency obviously indicates that he performed his editorial tasks with something less than seriousness.

However, none of Lenglet's critics seem to have even noticed this fact. The Président Bouhier was not altogether satisfied with the limits chosen by the editor, although the general tone of his remarks is more laudatory than one might have expected in view of the seriousness of his reservations:

Cette édition est certainement meilleure que les précédentes, où le stile de l'Auteur avoit été retouché. Mais il s'en faut beaucoup cependant qu'elle ne soit parfaite, par la faute de l'Editeur, qui n'a consulté que des manuscrits assez recens, et qui n'en a collationné aucun de la Bibliothèque du Roi, où il y en a de très anciens. J'en ai deux chez moi, dont l'un des meilleurs, qu'il y ait peut estre en France, n'estant guere que de 50 ans posterieur à Jean de Meun. ³⁴⁹

Indeed, that Bouhier had a measure of esteem for the edition may be judged by the fact that he couldn't accept it as the work of Lenglet; he wrote to Caumont on first seeing the work:

Je n'en connois pas l'Editeur. Mais seurement ce n'est pas l'Abbé Lenglet. Du moins je le crois ainsi: car j'aurois bien reconnu sa manière decrire. ³⁵⁰

Likewise the published critiques, such as that in the Observations sur les écrits modernes, make passing comments on Lenglet's failure to collate the oldest manuscripts - 'il s'est abstenu d'en consulter un trop grand nombre' - without dwelling overmuch on the principles involved. ³⁵¹ Lenglet's text was undoubtedly respected by many scholars: it was even used as a basis for the edition published in Paris by Fournier as late as 1799. ³⁵² Lionel Gossman quotes a manuscript note on one of the copies in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, probably by the Marquis de Paulmy, which reads 'Certainement voici la plus complete édition et la plus chargée de recherches qui ait paru sur le Roman de la Rose'. ³⁵³

The last volume of the edition contained various pieces appended by Lenglet, two of these being poems by Jean de Meung, others dealing with

the subject of alchemy with which the abbé had a growing fascination in his later years. The last item was a 'Glossaire', on which Lenglet remarked:

Ce que j'en ai dit suffit à ceux qui voudront lire seulement le Roman; les autres savent où aller chercher de plus amples explications de ces anciens mots, auxquelles un habile homme travaille depuis quelques années,³⁵⁴

The 'habile homme' to whom he refers was undoubtedly Lacurne de Sainte-Palaye, scholar of the Académie des Inscriptions, who had undertaken to compile a major 'Glossaire français' which would facilitate the preparation of correct editions of medieval documents and literary works. The scope of the work increased over the next decades, and it was unfortunately far from completion at the death of Sainte-Palaye in 1781; only the first volume was ever published, shortly before the Revolution.³⁵⁵ So Lenglet's hopes that it would be of use to his readers were vain; Lacurne however did make use of Lenglet's 'glossaire', which he transcribed by hand with his own corrections and additions, presumably for inclusion in his glossary.³⁵⁶ By this time however, a 344 page supplement to Lenglet's work had appeared anonymously, entitled Supplément au glossaire du Roman de la Rose contenant des notes critiques [...] une dissertation sur les auteurs [...] l'analyse de ce poème, un Discours sur l'utilité des glossaires, les variantes restituées sur un ms. de Mr. le président Bouhier de Savigny, et une table des auteurs cités dans cet ouvrage, published by Sirot in Dijon in 1737. This was by Jean-Lantin de Damerey, one of the group of young Burgundian scholars who gravitated around the Président Bouhier, and undoubtedly the person the latter spoke of in a letter to Caumont in August 1735 where he mentioned his own manuscript of the Roman:

Un de nos curieux, qui l'a examiné pieusement, par ce qu'il songeoit lui même à donner une edition de ce Roman, et qui en avoit vû plusieurs autres, croi qu'il n'a trouvé que dans le mien le véritable

texte de l'Auteur, il en avoit fait même un glossaire beaucoup plus ample, et va le faire imprimer, pour faire un 4e volume à ce Roman. ³⁵⁷

De Damerey obviously saw his task as one of remedying the lacunae of Lenglet's edition: he was given the cue by the critic in the Journal des savants who had commented on the inadequacy of Lenglet's 'Glossaire': 'Il a passé assez légèrement sur plusieurs expressions qui auroient peut-être demandé plus de recherches et d'explications'. ³⁵⁸

Finally, the ambiguous response to Lenglet's edition on the part of his contemporaries is well expressed by Claude Brossette who, in a letter to Bouhier in 1737, voiced his doubts about its worth, while at the same time informing him that it was commonly attributed to the erudite and respected Camille Falconet, who had been at the centre of the revival of interest in medieval French studies at the Académie des Inscriptions: ³⁵⁹

Ayez la bonté, Monsieur, de m'apprendre le nom de celui qui a procuré cette édition, précédée d'une préface, et suivie d'un Glossaire, assez imparfait. On l'attribue à M. l'Abbé Lenglet du Fresnoi, ou à M. Falconet;

he finished with a comparison, unfavourable to Lenglet, between the edition and the supplement:

Celui-ci me paroît infiniment meilleur, plus exact, plus étendu, plus recherché, et rempli d'une erudition très curieuse et très intéressante, de sorte que ce supplément est un Livre fort agreable et fort instructif par lui-même. ³⁶⁰

Lenglet exploits his fame

The last in this series of projects in the literary area was a proposed treatise De l'Usage et du choix des livres pour l'étude des belles-

lettres, avec des catalogues raisonnés des auteurs utiles ou nécessaires, pour se former dans les diverses parties de la littérature.

The title obviously aimed to capitalise on the success of the treatise on the novel, though this time the prospectus bears Lenglet's own name; the work, he stated, was aimed rather at amateurs and beginners than those well versed in the subject, but nonetheless it proposed to be very wide in scope. There would be nineteen sections in which he would try to 'réunir presque sous un même point de vue, ce qu'il y a de plus essentiel et de plus utile dans les regles que l'on a prescrites pour chaque partie des belles Lettres',³⁶¹ including rhetoric, criticism, and poetry, along with advice on the study of languages, the choice of books and editions, and what would have been an interesting chapter for the modern reader on 'De la prohibition des Livres, ses effets, son poids et son usage: de la recherche des Livres défendus'. These would be followed by nineteen 'catalogues pour les belles-lettres' and a few of those 'Traités rares' which he obviously felt were a formula for success in this sort of publication. The prospectus does not indicate how many volumes were envisaged, but it must have been a fairly major undertaking, as four publishers were associated in the project, Musier, Rollin and the two De Bures. The work never in fact materialised; it is likely that the response to the project which Lenglet invited did not show a sufficient degree of interest or approbation on the part of the public to warrant publication. I have only found two minor and neutral references to the prospectus in the periodical press.³⁶²

Not surprisingly, considering the reputation which Lenglet acquired through the editions and original works of this period, he became one of those figures whose name was automatically raised in connection with

other anonymous publications of a 'suspect' nature. Foremost among these was the Histoire des Papes, a strongly anti-Catholic satiric work in five volumes published in the Hague between 1732 and 1734, which aimed at exposing the corruption of the court of Rome over the centuries.³⁶³ Rumour immediately associated it with Lenglet, but the authorship was claimed by an impecunious young man named Bruys living at that time in Holland; he apparently returned to the Catholic fold after 1736.³⁶⁴ Another such work was the novel entitled Les Princesses malabares ou le célibat philosophique,³⁶⁵ an allegorical satire on the history of the Catholic church, and particularly the divisions within France itself, which obviously aimed at undermining the whole basis of the religious tradition. The work was condemned to the fires by order of the Parlement of 31st December 1734, on the grounds that it 'tendait de dessein formé à détruire tout principe, tout esprit de religion, et portait l'énormité du blasphème jusque sur nos mystères les plus saints et les plus adorables'.³⁶⁶ On the word of the abbé Goujet the work has been most generally attributed to a certain Louis-Pierre de Longue, who was a member of the Conti household at the time he wrote it.³⁶⁷ Lenglet himself listed the work in his manuscript additions to the Bibliothèque des romans, and remarked:

C'est un petit roman allegorique fort mauvais, et qui n'a fait du bruit en son temps, que parce qu'il y étoit parlé des matieres contestées dans la Religion.³⁶⁸

Although we have seen that Lenglet did not baulk at refuting his own works, nonetheless it is unlikely that he would have chosen such scathing and dismissive terms with which to qualify his judgements. It is interesting, however, that his name should have been generally linked with a work of this nature, although it does not relate stylistically to any of his known productions, and it indicates the strength of the reputation

for unorthodoxy which he had acquired in the public mind.

In the years between 1735 and 1739 Lenglet turned most of his attention back to the rather more serious works which had brought him success in earlier decades, the two Méthodes for learning history and geography. We have seen that the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire was published for the third time in 1735, and that a Supplément finally reached the public in 1739.³⁶⁹ The Méthode pour étudier la géographie was republished, in slightly augmented form, by Rollin and De Bure, in 1736.³⁷⁰ In re-editing these works Lenglet, or his publishers, evidently seized on the idea of producing an abridged version of both works for the use of children, in the consecrated 'question and answer' form most popular in the contemporary colleges. A number of Lenglet's critics questioned his motivation in these ventures. The Mémoires de Trévoux speak of the 'Méthodes' and the 'Abregés de Geographie' which have proliferated in latter years, and go on to assert:

Le débit, qu'ont eu plusieurs de ces petits Ouvrages, n'est pourtant pas une preuve de leur bonté, comme on n'en doit pas conclure non-plus que les derniers valent mieux que les premiers. Ce sont des Livres d'usage entre les mains des enfans; rien ne dure moins, et une édition est bien-tôt épuisée. Ce débit assuré est un grand appas pour ceux, qui veulent être Auteurs à peu de frais; rien n'est plus borné, et un Livre de cette nature est bien-tôt fait. Tout consiste à changer quelque chose dans la forme, et à corriger quelques fautes dans les anciens, bien entendu qu'on en laissera encore quelques-unes à corriger dans ceux, qui viendront après. On n'est point en peine de trouver un Imprimeur, sur tout quand on a un nom dans la République des Lettres, parce que la nouveauté plaît, et que la mode regne dans la littérature, comme partout ailleurs.³⁷¹

Indeed, it was difficult to avoid suspicion of Lenglet's motives when in his Preface to the Principes de l'histoire he praised the education given in the Collèges above that of the private tutor: he gave particular approbation to those of Paris, where, he claimed, education had made great progress over the last thirty years,³⁷² a judgement not shared by the

abbé Granet who had passed through the system much more recently than Lenglet.³⁷³ Nonetheless, in fairness, his remarks on the kind of subjects he would like to see taught in schools are interesting, if not altogether original, and show proof of the 'modern' turn of mind which he would again manifest in contributing to the Encyclopédie:

On devroit obliger les enfants à ne pas négliger l'écriture et le dessein, et à prendre quelques idées de Géométrie et de Mécanique. Ils sont capables de ces exercices, et même de tout ce qui est utile. Je voudrais de plus qu'on les formât à la Géographie et à l'Histoire; non seulement à l'histoire ancienne, mais même à l'Histoire moderne. Comme elle est plus proche de nous et de nos mœurs elle n'est pas moins utile que celle des premiers âges du monde.³⁷⁴

Less laudable, however, are the ridiculous reversals of judgement in favour of Jesuit historians from those which he had held in earlier works. He now prefers Daniel to Mezerai, recommends the Histoire romaine by Catrou and Rouillé; Desfontaines in the Observations sur les écrits modernes does not spare his irony on this account, and clearly points to Lenglet's self-interest in the matter.³⁷⁵ Lenglet's efforts did partially succeed in this instance in drawing a favourable response from the journalists of Trévoux, though they continued to be very negative in their criticisms of many of the works of this period.

Likewise, on the form of the works the critics were scathing, for Lenglet had condemned the question and answer method in a note in his Méthode pour étudier l'histoire concerning an Introduction à l'histoire de France par demandes et par réponses. The abbé then said:

Si j'avois à faire apprendre l'Histoire à des jeunes gens, je ne me servirois pas de la Méthode des Demandes et des Réponses.³⁷⁶

The critic in the Bibliothèque française, writing on Lenglet's Principes de l'histoire, aptly remarked:

Mr. Lenglet a reconnu, sans doute, par la suite que cette méthode étoit meilleure qu'il ne se l'étoit imaginé. Peut-être même aura-t-il senti que si elle est utile aux jeunes gens qu'on veut instruire en aidant à leur Mémoire à se fixer, elle ne l'est pas moins aux Auteurs, en multipliant à peu de frais leurs Volumes.³⁷⁷

Despite these criticisms, Lenglet's Géographie des enfants proved to be the most frequently reprinted of all his works; it was translated into English, German and Italian, and was still forming the basis of English editions as late as 1830.³⁷⁸ It was first published as Book I of the new edition of the Méthode pour étudier la géographie, but a number of copies were sold separately with their own title-page and 'Avertissement'. The work consisted of a 153-page summary of the descriptive world geography contained in the rest of the Méthode, together with lists of maps deemed necessary for children, though none were actually included in the volume: this failing was rectified in the edition of 1740. Within the year a second, separate edition came off the presses, and by June of the following year, 1737, the sixth augmented edition was in the shops. The Mémoire de Trévoux, in announcing it, remarked 'Ce livre est très-utile, par la bonne méthode qui y regne et par les additions qu'on y a faites'.³⁷⁹ If the Jesuit fathers approved of it, one may assume that it was used in the colleges around the country. The periodical press was, in general, mildly approbatory, though many of the critics picked out inaccuracies of detail for which the author was heavily censured, this being a work intended for young children.³⁸⁰ Their comments did not however impinge on the work's success, which was already consecrated by the time J.-B. Michault wrote in 1761:

On sçait combien ces Abrégés ont peu coûté à l'Auteur, et combien néanmoins ils lui ont été avantageux.³⁸¹

Even within the very year of the publication of the Géographie, the Observations sur les écrits modernes could comment on the prompt appearance of the first tomes of Lenglet's Principes de l'histoire pour l'éducation de la jeunesse:

Le succès de la Géographie pour les Enfants [...] a sans doute engagé l'Auteur à publier un Ouvrage sur l'Histoire dans le même goût, c'est-à-dire, par demandes et par réponses.³⁸²

This work was an undertaking of larger scope; it consisted of six volumes, each of which was intended as a year's programme for a class in the Collèges and could be bought separately.³⁸³ As the volumes appeared over a span of three years there were innumerable commentaries in the periodical press.³⁸⁴ Overall the judgements were fairly approbatory, except for the Mémoires de Trévoux which persisted in publishing long lists of errors of detail, and remarked with sour tones that:

[L'ouvrage est] presque le même, qui a été exécuté il y a longtems par M. le Ragois; et depuis trente-cinq ans au moins, ce que M. Lenglet du Fresnoy recommande qu'on fasse pratiquer aux Ecoliers, se pratique dans plusieurs Colleges avec le succès, que tout le monde sçait.³⁸⁵

The volume to receive most praise was the fourth one, devoted to the history of France; Lenglet was congratulated both for the emphasis he put on the importance of teaching the national history to children, and on the content of the work.³⁸⁶ One of the most common points of criticism refers to Lenglet's failure to execute the very traditionalist promise which he makes, especially in the Preface to the volume on Roman history, to teach morality in an effective manner through his history lessons:

Quoiqu'en dise M. l'Abbé Lenglet, la morale est si obscurément indiquée dans son ouvrage, qu'il est bien difficile qu'elle puisse être sentie par les jeunes gens.³⁸⁷

Knowing the abbé's unorthodox tendencies in his previous historical

writing it would indeed have been surprising to see him achieve such pious aims;³⁸⁸ once again we find that Lenglet is traditionalist in theory, but non-traditionalist in execution. The Principes did not attain the same degree of success as the Géographie des enfants; it was never translated into a foreign language, nor was it re-edited after the author's death. Michault commented 'Ce livre est un de ceux de l'Abbé Lenglet qui a souffert le moins de difficulté; aussi n'a-t-il pas eu une grande vogue',³⁸⁹ thus underlining the relation between the notoriety of Lenglet's works and their sales success. But it must be remembered that this work was in form specifically geared to the organisation of the French schools, and in content more heavily centred on France than its immediate predecessor.

On the completion of his Principes Lenglet, obviously deeply annoyed by the continual attacks on his works in the Trévoux journal, and particularly the article devoted to the new edition of his Méthode pour étudier la géographie of 1736,³⁹⁰ published a brochure entitled Lettre de M. l'abbé Lenglet du Fresnoy à l'auteur des Observations sur les Ecrits modernes, au sujet de la Méthode pour étudier la géographie,³⁹¹ this was probably intended for publication in the Observations, but was refused by Desfontaines. It consists largely of a satirical attack on the Jesuits, whom Lenglet taxes with ingratitude towards him, listing the services he rendered them in the Netherlands in 1709. He assures the reader that he considers the Jesuits' adverse comments to be a sure sign of the worth of a publication:

Mes amis m'ont dit plus d'une fois: les très RR. PP. Journalistes de Trevoux ont fait votre éloge; car ils ont critiqué vos Ouvrages. C'est une bonne marque, c'est la conduite qu'ils tiennent à l'égard de ce qui paroît de bon dans le monde littéraire. Ils vous aiment plus tendrement, qu'ils ne font les Auteurs vulgaires.³⁹²

He also answers a number of the specific criticisms expressed in the original offending article. Such a brochure could not, of course, help his relations with the Jesuits, as Michault remarked:

L'Auteur sentit bien par la suite que, soit qu'il eût fait des fautes, soit qu'il n'en eût point commis, ce qui étoit presque impossible, les Journalistes de Trévoux avoient tous les mois le privilège ou de le corriger aigrement, ou de lui donner toujours par provision de très-bons conseils. ³⁹³

Another critique of the Méthode pour étudier la géographie had been published in Paris in 1738, but this one was couched in the courteous terms of one scholar offering his comments to another respected scholar on a subject in which he has a specialised knowledge. It was entitled Lettre amiable d'un Napolitain à M. l'abbé Lenglet Du Fresnoy, par laquelle il est prié de corriger quelque endroit de sa géographie, touchant le Royaume de Naples. ³⁹⁴ Published anonymously, it was written by the librarian of the King of Naples, the erudite Matteo Egittio, who, J.-B. Michault asserts, was a 'secrétaire d'Ambassade' in France at the time. ³⁹⁵ Lenglet himself recognised the accuracy of many of Egittio's corrections, and took his remarks in extraordinarily good part. He apparently published a reply, ³⁹⁶ on which Michault commented:

L'Auteur de la Méthode[.] remercia son Censeur [de sa lettre], en avouant qu'il y avoit apperçu plus de vérité et moins d'emphase, que dans les sévères répréhensions des Mémorialistes de Trévoux. ³⁹⁷

Towards the close of the decade Lenglet was spoken of in rather less polite terms in one of those strange pieces of literary mystification to come off the Dutch presses; this was the Relation de ce qui s'est passé dans une assemblée tenue au bas du Parnasse pour la reforme des belles lettres, published by Paupie in the Hague in 1739. The work is a brilliant pastiche of quotations from a large number of authors,

mainly contemporary, worked into an account of a meeting of writers convoked by Apollo to 'clean up' the lamentably decadent Parnasse. The author maliciously satirises a number of well-known personages, among them our abbé to whom several references are made,³⁹⁸ There is one long passage in which Lenglet himself is allowed to voice his more 'outrageous' statements on novels; is in turn attacked by the Pere Daniel and a 'Journaliste de Trévoux' (no doubt the Père Bougeant), and defended by Marot who is delighted with the 'obscénités' with which Lenglet has adorned his work. The worthy Brossette is at last given his chance of revenge on the subject of the 'Eloge historique de Monsieur Rousseau'. The speech made by the Jesuit journalist is particularly vituperative:

Lorsqu'il paroît un ouvrage plein de mauvais raisonnemens et de contradictions; d'une érudition puisée dans les sources les plus décriées, de traits injurieux, de médisances atroces, où l'on nomme les personnes par leur nom, sans aucun égard à la bienséance, ni aux bonnes moeurs; de saillies pleines d'impiétés, qui font frémir la Religion; de discours pleins d'indécence, qui font rougir la Pudeur; joignés à tout cela une manière d'écrire, soi disant libre et enjouée, mais froide et plâte, sans suite, sans ordre, sans liaison, confondant pêle mêle le Sacré et le profane, le vrai et le faux, le serieux et le Burlesque: voila dit-on, infailliblement un Ouvrage de Lenglet; c'est là son coin et sa marque. De pareils écrits mériteroient qu'on en fit un sacrifice à Vulcain, mais c'est l'affaire des Magistrats; mon devoir est borné à décrier ces sortes d'Ouvrages pernecieux: heureux! si je pouvois me flater d'en inspirer l'horreur, et le mépris qu'ils méritent.³⁹⁹

Despite the number of disparaging passages aimed at Lenglet, there has been some speculation as to whether he could have had a hand in the preparation of the text.⁴⁰⁰ The work had a long and complicated history; It was generally attributed to the Abbé Gachet d'Artigny, an ecclesiastic from the town of Vienne in the Dauphiné where he spent all his life; he was a bibliophile and enthusiastic collector of literary bric-à-brac.⁴⁰¹ In his periodical Nouveaux mémoires d'histoire, de critique et de littérature he explicitly claims the authorship of the 1739

edition, and recounts that when the book proved popular he sent the manuscript of a second, revised and augmented edition to the original publisher Paupie; the latter, however, sold the manuscript without the author's permission to Jean Neaulme, a colleague in the Hague, who held on to it for ten years, and then published only the first part in a collection entitled Petit réservoir, contenant une variété de faits historiques et critiques.⁴⁰² D'Artigny responded by himself publishing part of the second edition in his Nouveaux mémoires.⁴⁰³ The question of the authorship of the work was raised by Professor Jean Sgard in his study of Prévost romancier, based largely on a stylistic comparison between the biting and witty 1739 edition, and the heavy-handed humour in the extracts published by d'Artigny himself: this led him to the hypothesis of a 'rewriting' of the 1739 edition by Paupie's collaborator, Prévost.⁴⁰⁴ Lenglet's name can also be raised in this connection, for he was known to have inserted many unavowed additions into the early volumes of the unfortunate d'Artigny's Mémoires, in his capacity of editorial assistant to De Bure;⁴⁰⁵ most specifically he had added a large number of notes to the first volume. Could the statement claiming authorship of the 1739 edition, in a note on p.323 of Vol.I, therefore be Lenglet's, and not d'Artigny's? This is highly improbable, for d'Artigny himself identified and listed Lenglet's notes in his Preface to that volume, and this specific note does not figure among them. Moreover, had there been any deliberate mystification on Lenglet's part, d'Artigny had ample opportunity to denounce it in volume VII of his Mémoires, which was published after Lenglet's death, and in which he denounces Lenglet's treatment of him on three other accounts.⁴⁰⁶ It is, in any case, difficult to see any reason why Lenglet should have been connected with a work which vilified him to such a degree. If there

was a 'rewriting', then the evidence in favour of Prévost's intervention is far stronger than any which could point to Lenglet's involvement, and in that case the reasons for the attack on latter are evident.

The period we have just surveyed was a highly prolific one, which saw the appearance of Lenglet's most controversial and unorthodox work. It was not, however, free from family worries: it will be remembered that in 1735 his brother Jacques Lenglet de Percel was arrested in Paris, and Nicolas made efforts to intervene on his behalf with the authorities. In January 1737 his sister's husband, Urbain de la Barre, with whom the abbé had been closely associated for many years, died.⁴⁰⁷ With the beginning of the new decade Lenglet seems to have reached a new maturity, and he turns his attention to the editing of a different type of material. It will, in the main, be of a more 'serious' nature than the light-hearted and often self-indulgent literary editions on which he has now, at the age of fifty-five, closes the cover.

Notes to Chapter IV

1. Cf. Chapter III above, pp.130 ff.
2. Cf. above, p.83 and 106, and Bibliography, 11.04, re supposed edition of 1716; the 'Nouvelles littéraires' in the Bibliothèque française for 1724 state that Lenglet, returned from his imprisonment in Strasbourg, 'se dispose à donner une nouvelle Edition de sa Méthode pour étudier l'Histoire, qu'il a augmentée d'un Traité de Chronologie et de 4 grandes Cartes qui contiendront tous les différens systèmes des Auteurs sur cette matière, avec la manière de les concilier' (xliii, 300). The Privilège de réimprimer was given to Antoine-Urbain Coustelier in May 1723 (see Méthode, 1729 ed.).
3. See Bibliography, 11.09; a compte-rendu on the Prospectus appeared in the 'Nouvelles littéraires' of the Journal des savants for Mar. 1728, pp.190-1 .
4. Apr. 1728, p.255.
5. See article on the Méthode in the Mémoires de Trévoux, Nov. 1729, pp.1987-8: 'Le projet de l'édition de ce Livre proposé par souscriptions, dans un tems où l'on refusoit d'accorder des souscriptions pour divers Ouvrages, attira une attention particulière', and Lenglet's own account in the Dedication to the Marquis de Santa-Cruz (Méthode, 1729 ed., vol.i).
6. Claude Gros de Boze (1680-1753) became a member of the Académie des Inscriptions in 1705, and was Secrétaire perpétuel from 1706 to 1742; in 1715 he replaced Fénelon at the Académie Française. He wrote many works of erudition on classical antiquity, and in collaboration with the abbé Goujet, the Histoire and Mémoires of the Académie des Inscriptions. He also wrote articles for the Journal des savants (Biog.univers., v, 393-4).
7. For details and discussion of the censored material see Appendix below. The terms cancellans or carton refer to the new leaf printed to replace the original material which had to be suppressed; an original leaf, intended to be excised and replaced, will be referred to as a cancellandum (cf. R.W. Chapman's Cancels, London, Constable, 1930).
8. This may explain the insulting remark made about her by Lenglet in his edition of the Arrêts d'amour: see below, pp.191-2.
9. Alvar de Navia Osorio de Santa-Cruz de Marzenado (c. 1687-1732), military officer and diplomat, became a field-marshal in 1718; he was plenipotentiary of the King of Spain at the Congress of Soissons in 1727, and afterwards was appointed Spanish ambassador at the French court. While in Paris he carried out a number of experiments with military arms; he had already published 10 vols. of Réflexions militaires in Turin in 1724-. He had planned to publish

a history of Spanish diplomacy (see below pp.178-9), but having been appointed governor of Oran he was killed in battle against the Moors in Nov. 1732 (Biog.univers., xxxvii, 671).

10. Lenglet makes several references to his relations with the Marquis at the time. See for example p.372 (cancellandum) of his Histoire de la monarchie française, vol.iii, where Lenglet reports an anecdote 'que j'appris alors du Marquis de Santa-Cruz, Plénipotentiaire d'Espagne au Congrès de Soissons, et qui m'avoit fait la grace de me prendre en amitié'; see also Lettres, négociations et pièces secrètes, pp.27-9. Lenglet may, on the other hand, have been working as a clerk/secretary for the French government: I have found no mention of his name in this connection in the Archives des affaires étrangères, but in the collection of Mémoires et documents, vol.496, entitled 'Histoire du Congrès tenu à Soissons pendant le cours de l'année 1728 entre les Ministres plénipotentiaires des principales puissances de l'Europe, faite en décembre 1736 par N.L. Le Dran, premier commis des Affaires Etrangères', there is a section written almost certainly in Lenglet's hand (ff.469-77). This deals with the period Dec. 1729-Feb. 1732; it would therefore suggest that Lenglet was working occasionally for the Ministry even as late as 1736.
11. Méthode, 1729 ed., i, p.ii.
12. See Renée Simon, Henri de Boulainvillier, p.470; there are at least 8 copies of the ms. extant: for the purposes of this thesis I have used the copy in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Franç. 6363-4.
13. See Vernière, Spinoza et la pensée française avant la Révolution, Paris, P.U.F., 1954, i, 311.
14. In his 'Avertissement' the Comte indeed declares: 'Je crois qu'on pourra reconnoître dans mon travail l'amour sincère que je porte à la vérité à la justice et à une morale droite et simple' (Franç. 6363, p.3), an aspiration which is not belied by his text.
15. Cf. Vernière, op.cit., pp.312 ff.
16. Franç. 6363, p.3.
17. Cf. Ira O. Wade, The Clandestine organization and diffusion of philosophic ideas in France from 1700 to 1750, Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1938, pp.5-6; the fact that there are 8 known copies extant itself points to the extent of its distribution.
18. Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 140, f.191.
19. Méthode pour étudier l'histoire, ed. 1772, i, pp.xii-xv.
20. 'Lenglet-Dufresnoy éditeur et plagiaire de Boulainvilliers', Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France, lxi(1969), 209-17.
21. For a full discussion of the censorship of this edition see Appendix, pp.471-86.

22. Histoire d'un voyage littéraire fait en 1733 en France, en Angleterre et en Hollande, La Haye, Moetiens, 1735, p.117.
23. See the Journal des savants, May 1729, p.316, and the Journal littéraire, xiv(1729), 238-41; longer articles were published in the Journal des savants, 1730, pp.300-4, and 327-36, and in the Mémoires de Trévoux (see below notes 24, 26, 28, and 30).
24. Mémoires de Trévoux, 1729, pp.1987-2020.
25. Ibid., p.2006.
26. Ibid., 1730, pp.175-8.
27. Re these 'Mémoires' see Michault, Mémoires, pp.212-6: he had the original autographs in his possession, together with other letters concerning the affair.
28. See Mémoires de Trévoux, Oct. 1730, pp.1750-70. See also Michault, op.cit., pp.214-5 for the original wording of part of the 'Mémoire'; there is a ms. copy of the original version in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, ms.6033, ff.53-60.
29. Mémoires de Trévoux, Oct. 1730, p.1752.
30. Ibid., 1731, pp.778-803, and 900-15.
31. Ibid., p.802. See also p.800: 'Par quelle fatalité, M. et au profit de qui arrive-t-il que vous dites du même sentiment, et qu'il est propre aux incrédules et qu'il est le vôtre?'
32. Ibid., p.793.
33. Lenglet had quoted this statement (from his Méthode, i, 130) in his own justification (Mémoires de Trévoux, 1730, p.1754); the Jesuits were perspicacious in linking this remark with Spinoza, whose influence had reached Lenglet through Boulainvilliers' Abrégé (cf. Vernière, Spinoza, pp.311 ff.).
34. Mémoires de Trévoux, 1731, p.912.
35. Pp.300-4.
36. Michault, Mémoires, p.76.
37. Franç. 24409, f.106, letter dated 6 Mar. 1729. Jean-Baptiste Bonardy (late 17th century - 1756) was a Docteur en Sorbonne, and librarian to the Cardinal de Noailles. An opponent of the Bull Unigenitus, he published a few brochures on questions of theology; he left a number of works of a bibliographical nature in manuscript. He was a regular correspondent of Bouhier's (Biog.univers., iv, 684).
38. Michault, op.cit., p.76; Michault is, in fact, here quoting the critic in the Journal littéraire, xiv(1729), pp.240-1.

39. See Bibliography, 11.12 and 11.13.
40. See edition 1735, in-4°, p.xviii.
41. See Bibliography, 11.15. A critique of this edition was published in the Bibliothèque française (xxvi, 248-73) strongly attacking Lenglet's affected show of chauvinistic feelings, which led him to attack the 'Provinces unies' and make a number of anti-Protestant sallies: these are typical of Lenglet's 'political' manoeuvres to make his books ostensibly orthodox and acceptable to the French government.
42. See 'Avertissement du libraire', 1735 ed. (in-4°), p.xviii.
43. See Bibliography, 11.16 and 11.17.
44. Secousse, in a letter to Bouhier dated 16 Feb. 1741, remarked à propos of the Supplément: 'Cet ouvrage est aussi peu exact et aussi peu mesuré que tous ceux qu'il a donnés jusqu'à présent. On prétend qu'il y a inséré tout ce que Mr. de Boze avait fait retrancher dans sa Méthode' (Correspondance littéraire du Président Bouhier, ed. H. Duranton, Saint-Etienne, Centre de Saint-Etienne, 1974, i, 40).
45. The censor, de Marcilly, does not appear to have demanded any excisions, and the terms of his approbation were highly laudatory: 'Il paroît qu'il ne reste rien à désirer à ceux, qui veulent se mettre au fait de cette Science; l'Auteur de ce Supplément a suffisamment exposé ce qui doit en faciliter l'étude. L'on peut dire en conséquence que la Méthode dont il s'agit, devient dans son genre ce que l'on pouvoit attendre de plus parfait et de plus nécessaire.' (4° ed., p.279). Of course, the censorship directives were interpreted differently by each individual censor, and it may well be that de Marcilly was simply less diligent or less perceptive than Gros de Boze, the censor of the 1729 ed., who was no doubt anxious to protect his own respected position.
46. Bibliothèque française, xxxiii(1741), 170.
47. Observations sur les écrits modernes, xxiii(1741), 264.
48. Ibid., xxv(1741), p.279. There were also 'notices' published in the Journal des savants, Feb. 1741, p.128, and the Mémoires de Trévoux, 1741, pp.1891-4.
49. See Marie-Anne Merland, 'Tirage et vente de livres à fin du XVIIIe siècle: des documents chiffrés', Revue française d'histoire du livre, 1973, pp.13 and 22. Interestingly, Drouet, the editor of the 1772 ed., took the decision to 'round off' Lenglet's borrowings with further material from Boulainvilliers' Abrégé, as he explains in his Preface: 'On s'est donc borné [...] à réunir ensemble les différens morceaux employés dans la Méthode et le Supplément, pour en former un tout suivi; à les comparer sur différentes copies de l'Ouvrage du Comte de Boulainvilliers, pour remplir les lacunes et rectifier les

inexactitudes qui se trouvoient dans l'imprimé: enfin, et c'est le travail le plus considérable, à remplir les vuides qui se trouvoient entre le point où finit le Comte de Boulainvilliers, et celui où l'abbé Lenglet reprend le récit circonstancié des événemens'. (i, p.xv)

50. See Note 2 above and Chapter III, p.130. In a 'Mémoire' to Dubois in July 1722 Lenglet stated his intention of going to Holland on his way back from Vienna, 'pour y faire graver les 4 Tables chronologiques qu'on a trouvé dans ses papiers' (Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 140, f.326). See Bibliography, 17.01.
51. The compte-rendu in the Mercure de France, Jan. 1768, ii, 172-3, states that 'Ces cartes, très connues, ont le mérite de la clarté et de la précision'.
52. Cf. Biog.univers., xxxvii, 671.
53. L'Europe pacifiée par l'équité de la reine de Hongrie, 1745, pp.131-2. Lenglet actually names Santa-Cruz in the same connection in his Lettres, négociations et pièces secrètes, 1744, pp.28-9.
54. It is probable, of course, that Lenglet's name would never have appeared in the published edition: his position was most likely equivalent to that of the contemporary research assistant, whose work is published under the name of a more eminent figure in return for some financial compensation.
55. See Bibliography, 18.01.
56. See Bibliography, 18.02.
57. See Bibliography, 22.01. The edition is announced in the Journal des savants, Oct. 1732, p.624.
58. It is generally held by contemporary scholars that Thomas Hemerken, called a 'Kempis (1379/80-1471) was the author of the De Imitatione Christi, and that Jean Charlier, called de Gerson (1363-1429) translated it into French (cf. Dictionnaire des oeuvres, ed. Laffont-Bompiani, Paris, 1962, iii, 28).
59. See the 'Avertissement', pp.iii-xiii.
60. Paris, Lefèvre, 1812, p.69.
61. Le Mercure, Nov. 1742, pp.2346-60; there is also a separate copy in the Mazarine library (shelf-no. 47199).
62. Barbier, op.cit., pp.71-2.
63. Henri-Jean Martin showed the numerical importance of treatises on spirituality in the book-stocks of the late seventeenth-century libraires, which phenomenon continued well into the following century: the Imitation was foremost among these (Livre, pouvoirs et société à Paris au XVIIe siècle, ii, 782 ff.).

64. See below Chapter V , p.336.
65. See Bibliography, 22.02 - 22.04.
66. See the 'Approbation et privilège', at the front of the volume.
67. See letter Don Luiz da Cunha to Rousseau, 2 Mar. 1731, quoted in Paul Bonnefon, 'J.-B. Rousseau et Lenglet Du Fresnoy', Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France, vii(1900), p.549. Bonnefon does not quote the source of his material.
68. Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 140, f.315; cf. Chapter III, p.130.
69. Cf. below p.248, and Chapter V re the editions of French historical interest which Lenglet produced in the 1740 s.
70. See Lionel Gossman, Medievalism and the ideologies of the enlightenment. The world and work of Lacurne de Sainte-Palaye, Baltimore, John Hopkins, 1968.
71. See ibid., p.65.
72. Quoted by Gossman, ibid., p.168 (from B.N. ms. Bréquigny 62, f.203).
73. Daniel Mornet, 'Les Enseignements des bibliothèques privées (1750-80)', Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France, xvii(1910), 481 ff.; he makes special mention of Lenglet's editions of the Marot, the Roman de la rose and the Arrêts d'amour, as well as the Coustelier collection with which Lenglet was originally to be involved (cf. below pp.191 - 3). See my separate discussion of each of these works.
74. See Gossman, op.cit., pp.160 ff.
75. Ibid., p.163.
76. Michault, op.cit., pp.53-4.
77. Mornet, op.cit., p.481.
78. See Revue des cours et conférences, Nov. 1908-Mar. 1909, p.506.
79. See Bibliography, 20.01 and 20.02 ; the Dedication is signed 20 Oct. 1730, and the first critique dates from the first quarter of the year 1731 (Le Nouvelliste du Parnasse, ii, 49-64).
80. Michault, Mémoires, p.164.
81. Les Oeuvres de Clément Marot, de Cahors [...] reveues, augmentées de plusieurs choses et disposées en beaucoup meilleur ordre que ci-devant. Plus, quelques oeuvres de Michel Marot, fils dudit Marot. [Edité par F. Mizière]. Niort, T. Portau, 1596. There are four other editions preceding Lenglet's listed in the B.N. Catalogue, the last being that published by Moetjens, The Hague, 1714.

82. Cf. the abbé Goujet's Bibliothèque française, (Paris, Mariette et Guerin, 1741-56), xi, 62-3, which lists Lenglet's additions.
83. See above Chapter III, p.104 and pp.115ff, re Lenglet's earlier association with Hoym.
84. See the Dedication of the edition 'A son Excellence Monseigneur le Comte Hoym Ministre d'Etat de Sa Majesté Polonoise, et son Ambassadeur en France', 4° ed., pp.iii-x; for details of the incident see also Pichon, Vie de Charles Henry Comte de Hoym, i, 154. In his note on the Advocate in T.IV of the Oeuvres Lenglet is presumably speaking under his pseudonym of de Percel, and so refers to himself as 'un ami': 'J'en ai trouvé non seulement une Edition gothique fort ancienne que j'ai prié un de mes amis de m'acheter dans la vente des livres de M. l'abbé Brochard; mais cet ami a fait plus, il a bien voulu à ma priere conferer l'imprimé sur l'exemplaire MS. qui se trouve dans la Bibliothèque de S.A.S. Monseigneur le Duc de Bourbon'. (p.293).
85. See i, pp.xi ff.
86. Cf. Dedication, 4° ed., p.viii, and Note 1, p.293.
87. Gossman, op.cit., p.229. Conversely, the conclusions reached by Manson Milner Brien in his article on 'The development of critical editing by Abbé Lenglet du Fresnoy' are largely indefensible: he states that 'every editor and student of an old French historical or literary text owes profound gratitude to Lenglet du Fresnoy for having brought order and honor to their professional methods. He succeeded because he was industrious, accurate, and impartial, because he was sincere in his desire to benefit the public' (Papers of the Michigan Academy, xxiii (1937), 507-16).
88. Le Nouvelliste du Parnasse, ii (1731), 50-1.
89. Goujet, op.cit., xi, 62.
90. Michault, Mémoires, p.163.
91. Marot, 4° ed., i, p.iv.
92. Goujet, op.cit., xi, 63-4.
93. Marot, 4° ed., i, pp.64-5.
94. La Bibliothèque française, xi, 64-5.
95. See below, pp.230-3.
96. Le Pour et contre, iv, 47-8.
97. See below, pp.207-8. There was, however, one cancellandum in the Preface section of the 4° edition, which may represent a change forced by the 'correcteur' (see Bibliography).
98. Le Nouvelliste du Parnasse, ii, 100.

99. Marot, ed. in-4°, i, 99.
100. Le Nouvelliste du Parnasse, ii, 98-9. M.M. Brien remarks that Lenglet quotes from fifty-three 15th and 16th-century authors in his historical, philological and literary notes (op.cit., p.512). See the terms of the criticism made by the abbé Pierre Barral et al. in the Dictionnaire historique, littéraire et critique, (s.l. & Avignon, 1758-9): 'Il a noyé un texte obscène dans un Commentaire plus licentieux encore. Il y a à la vérité des notes littéraires et historiques qui prouvent que le Commentateur étoit très-versé dans l'Histoire du règne de François I, et dans la lecture de nos anciens Poètes, mais la plupart sont badines jusqu'à la bouffonnerie, plaisantes jusqu'à la bassesse, libres jusques à l'obscénité' (iv, 97).
101. For other reviews see Le Journal littéraire, xvii(1731), 203-7, and Le Journal des savants, 1731, pp.605-9.
102. Published in Paris by Constant-Chantpie.
103. See Pichon, op.cit., pp.177-8: the author does not give references for his material.
104. Ibid., p.178.
105. Cf. for example Chapter VI, pp.410-11 re his contribution to the Encyclopédie.
106. See Bibliography, 23.01 . Martial d'Auvergne (c. 1440-1508) was one of the most famous and spirituels of 15th-century writers, but little is known of his life. The oldest known edition of the Arrêts was published in Paris in 1528. (Biog.univers., xxvii, 100-1).
107. Cf. Jean Gay, Bibliographie des ouvrages relatifs à l'amour, i, 272.
108. The latest edition in French listed in the B.N. Catalogue is not dated; the last dated edition (Hanau, 1611) is in Latin.
109. Michault, Mémoires, p.158; he adds 'L'abbé Lenglet avoit un talent particulier pour rendre ces sortes de Discours préliminaires, instructifs et agréables'.
110. P.528.
111. Cf. Bibliography, 23.01, variant imprint.
112. See Delort, Détention des philosophes, ii, 77, and Bastille 10880, ff.252 and 259; B.12550, f.96. The colporteur would probably have been one of those non-licensed book-hawkers whose clandestine activities the authorities attempted to curb by licensing ever-increasing numbers of official colporteurs (cf. Martin, Livre, pouvoirs et société, i, 356).
113. Delort, op.cit., p.77. The only external evidence we have as to its popularity is based on Mornet's research into private libraries:

he found copies of this edition figuring in 19 out of the 500 catalogues which he studied (op.cit., pp.481-2).

114. Bastille 10880, f.259; this letter was published in Ravaisson, Les Archives de la Bastille, xii, 149.
115. The rest of the sentence reads 'c'est-à-dire ses propres lumières, dans les belles, mais très mauvaises et très fautives éditions, qu'il donnoit de nos anciens Poètes, dont il prétendoit sans doute augmenter plutôt les fautes que renouveler les impressions' (Les Arrêts d'amour, p.xxv).
116. Bastille 10880, f.259. The second offending remark occurs on p.xxxv of the Arrêts.
117. Ibid.
118. In his edition of Marot Lenglet had remarked, à-propos of the Advocate des Dames, that 'cette piece [...] manque dans toutes les Editions du recueil des oeuvres de Jean Marot, meme dans celle que ce petit brouillon de Coustelier Libraire avoit publié en 1722' (4° ed., iv, 293).
119. The other poets included in the collection were Crétin and Racan.
120. Cf. above Chapter III, p.130.
121. These works were still in manuscript at his death: cf. Michault's list of the 'Ouvrage manuscrits', Mémoires, p.211.
122. See Le Mercure de France, Feb. 1724, p.196, and Apr. 1724, pp.651-2.
123. Ibid., Apr. 1724, pp.648-9.
124. See ibid., p.649: 'Cependant Martial d'Auvergne, Pathelin, Villon, Coquillard, Cretin, Jean Marot, &c. étoient tous les jours recherché avec un empressement inexprimable par une infinité d'honnêtes gens de toutes sortes de conditions'.
125. See Mornet, op.cit., p.481.
126. See Bastille 10880, f.252, and 12550, f.96.
127. Delort, Détention des philosophes, pp.77-8.
128. See Bibliography, 23.01.
129. See Bibliography, 21.01.
130. See Paul Vernière, Spinoza et la pensée française, pp.322 and 373-5.
131. The letter had already been published as an appendix to François Lamy's Nouvel athéisme renversé (Paris, Roulland, 1696).
132. See Norman Torrey, 'Boulainvilliers: the man and the mask', Studies on Voltaire and the eighteenth century, 1(1955), 171; this copy is evidently conserved in Voltaire's library in Leningrad.

133. Ira O. Wade, The clandestine organisation, Chapter 1 and pp.266 ff.
134. The ambivalence of Boulainvilliers' position is well illustrated by the fact that one of his young friends, and avid collector of his manuscripts, the Marquis René-Louis de Voyer d'Argenson (1694-1757), was later to become a Minister in the royal administration: just one more indication of the divided consciousness of the French noble classes of the period. A number of the manuscripts collected by d'Argenson were passed on to his nephew, the Marquis de Paulmy, and thus entered the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal: on one copy of the 'Essai de métaphysique' (ms. 2235) there is a note, obviously dictated by de Paulmy, suggesting that this copy was Boulainvilliers' own, for the Marquis got it from his father 'qui avoit eu de grandes relations avec luy' (cf. below pp.199-200). Although Wade has shown that professional copyists were harassed by the police, nonetheless the tolerance-level on the part of the royal administrators must undoubtedly have been relatively high, for as long as these works were being distributed only, or largely, among the members of their own class and the respectable members of the academies.
135. See 'Avertissement' to the Réfutation; Lenglet may even be referring to the d'Argenson copy described in note 134 above, to which he could not have had access without an advanced degree of complicity on the part of the Marquis.
136. Le Journal littéraire, xix(1732), 188.
137. For the affirmation that the book was printed in Amsterdam see Michault; op.cit., p.159, and the Bibliothèque raisonnée des ouvrages des savants de l'Europe, vii(1731), 186.
138. Bibliothèque raisonnée..., vii(1731), 186.
139. Michault, op.cit., pp.43-4.
140. For an analysis of the Essai see Gustave Lanson, Revue des cours et conférences, Mar.-July 1908, pp.245-9; Ira O. Wade, op.cit., pp.116-23; Renée Simon, Henri de Boulainviller, pp.494 ff. (Mme Simon bases her analysis on Lenglet's edition, without ever attributing it to him; she underemphasises the importance which Boulainvilliers obviously attached to Spinoza's ideas). See also Paul Vernière, op.cit., pp.315-22, who qualifies Boulainvilliers' essay as a 'paraphrase banale et incomplète' (p.515), but recognises the ever-growing Spinozist sympathies in the Comte's work.
141. Vernière points out that Boulainvilliers failed to deal with 2 of the 5 books of the Ethics (op.cit., pp.317 and 374).
142. Lanson, op.cit., p.249.
143. Cf. Vernière, op.cit., p.374. Mme R. Simon nonetheless overstates its facility when she says 'qu'en face du grand traité de Spinoza et de sa "sécheresse mathématique", l'Essai nous apparaît comme une sorte de roman philosophique' (op.cit., p.495).

144. Vernière, op.cit., pp.373-5, and p.318.
145. Ibid., p.322.
146. Norman Torrey, op.cit.; Torrey's analysis has been fully adopted by Lester Segal in his more recent article 'Lenglet Du Fresnoy: the treason of a cleric in eighteenth-century France', Studies on Voltaire and the eighteenth century, cxvi(1973), 251-79.
147. See Réfutation, pp.151-8.
148. Ibid., p.155.
149. See ibid., p.156.
150. Franç. 12242-3.
151. See ibid. and Franç. 9111; also Bibl. Mazarine mss.3558 and 3560(2), and Arsenal mss. 2235 and 2236. The Essai, with Boulainvilliers' Preface, has been published by Renée Simon in Henri de Boulainvilliers. Oeuvres philosophiques, The Hague, Nijhoff, 1973, i, 83-212, but the editor fails to indicate on which of the manuscript sources she has based her text, or to give variants: her editorial methodology seems to be as arbitrary as that of Lenglet. The Simon text differs in a number of places from that of Lenglet.
152. See Henry Martin, Histoire de la Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, Paris, 1899, p.102.
153. I am indebted for this dating to M. Guignard, Conservateur en chef of the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal.
154. This Vie is attributed to Lucas by the Nouvelles littéraires, x(1719), 41: the editor in his introductory note states 'On pourroit dire, et peut-être avec certitude, que tout l'ouvrage est du fait du feu Sr. Lucas, si fameux dans ces Provinces par ses Quintessences; mais encore plus par ses moeurs, et sa maniere de vivre'. Paul Vernière, among other critics, accepted Lenglet's assertion that the Vie he published was that of Colerus (op.cit., pp.501, 516 et passim).
155. Cf. Gabriel Peignot, Dictionnaire critique, littéraire et bibliographique des principaux livres condamnés au feu, supprimés ou censurés, Paris, Renouard, 1806, p.132.
156. See Prosper Marchand, Dictionnaire historique, ou mémoires critiques et littéraires, the Hague de Hondt, 1758-9, i, 324. Marchand, however, gives the date of the edition as 1719: he was probably confusing it with the version published in the Nouvelles littéraires (see Note 157 below).
157. Vol.x, 40-74; Both versions of the Vie were republished by J.G.Pratt in the Oeuvres complètes de Spinoza, Paris, Hachette, 1863, vol.1, 40-74.
158. This was underlined by the critic in the Bibliothèque raisonnée des ouvrages des savants de l'Europe, vii(1731), 167.

159. Michault, Mémoires, p.161.
160. Johannes Bredenburg, from Rotterdam, published in 1675 a treatise entitled Enervatio tractatus theologico-politici, unà cum demonstratione, geometrico ordine dispositâ, naturam non esse Deum... which was a refutation of Spinoza, but, the Biographie universelle informs us, 'On prétend que Bredenburg, toujours occupé de sa démonstration, avait fini par la trouver vicieuse, et qu'il en composa la contradiction ... en flamand'. An unfaithful friend published the work secretly, and it was this which provoked the bitter controversy with Orobio and other theologians (Biog.univers., v, 457).
161. Cf. Torrey, op.cit., pp.171-2.
162. Isaac de Castro Orobio (d.1687), was born in Spain or Portugal to parents of Jewish origin, who professed to be Catholics. He succeeded brilliantly in his studies in Salamanca, where he got a chair of philosophy, and then turned to medicine which he taught in Seville. Having admitted his attachment to Judaism he was imprisoned for three years by the Inquisition. He went to Toulouse, and from thence to Amsterdam where he solemnly abjured Catholicism. He taught medicine in Holland for the rest of his life, and wrote a number of works attacking the divinity of Christ; one collection of his articles published posthumously was entitled Israël vengé. His Certamen philosophicum was nonetheless regarded as one of the most effective refutations of Spinozist ideas (Biog.univers., xxxi, 408).
163. La Bibliothèque raisonnée des ouvrages des savants de l'Europe, vii (1731), pp.163-86, and Le Journal littéraire, xix(1732), pp.185-200.
164. Bibliothèque raisonnée, vii, 179.
165. Ibid., p.186.
166. Le Journal littéraire, pp.185-6.
167. Bibliographie instructive, Paris, De Bure, 1763-8, entry no. 869.
168. Peignot, op.cit., p.133.
169. Vernière, op.cit., p.374.
170. See Bibliography, 19.01\.
171. See the approbation in the volume which is dated 12 Feb. 1728.
172. Rouen, Besongne, 1618, 115pp.
173. La Bibliothèque française, xvi(1731), p.178.
174. Bibliothèque universelle des romans, ouvrage périodique, ii (Apr. 1781), 4-5, quoted by Silas P. Jones, A list of French prose fiction from 1700 to 1750, New York, H.W. Wilson, 1939, p.52.

175. Bibliothèque française, p.178.
176. Le Nouvelliste du Parnasse, ou réflexions sur les ouvrages nouveaux, ii(1731), 68-72.
177. Bibliothèque des romans, 1734, p.112.
178. See ibid., copy in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Réserve y²1214/5/6.
179. The work is, however, generally attributed to Lenglet: see Barbier, Dictionnaire des ouvrages anonymes, i, 527, and Quérard, La France littéraire, v, 158.
180. See Bibliography, 24.01. This edition is universally attributed to Lenglet: see Jean Gay, Bibliographie des ouvrages relatifs à l'amour, iii, 286, and Quérard, La France littéraire, v, 160.
 Béroalde de Verville (1558 - c. 1612) was brought up a Protestant, but turned Catholic on his father's death and became a cleric; he wrote a number of works under the title Appréhensions spirituelles. The Biographie universelle remarks: 'Il manquait de jugement. Son style est diffus, et si embrouillé que la lecture même de ses poèmes est très-pénible' (iv, 97). Le Moyen de parvenir was a work of a different type, however, whose unorthodox treatment of religion raised doubts about the strength of Béroalde's Catholic convictions.
181. Quoted by Gay from the Bibliothèque clérico-galante (op.cit., iii, 290).
182. See Lenglet's notes on La Monnoye's 'Dissertation'. La Monnoye (1641-1728), poet and philologist, had been a member of the Académie Française, and a protégé of the Cardinal de Rohan, through whose literary gatherings Lenglet may have met him. (cf. Nouv.biog. gén., xxix, 231-5).
183. The Catalogue of printed books of the British Library (xvi, 158), attributes this edition to Charles-Joseph Panckouke (1736-98), at this time a libraire in Lille; he later moved to Paris, where his publishing-house became a rendez-vous for the most distinguished writers, and he undertook the publication of the Encyclopédie méthodique (Biog.univers., xxxii, 63-4). I have not, however, found any evidence to substantiate this attribution.
184. See above Chapter III, pp.131-2.
185. See Lenglet's Mémoire to Dubois, Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 140, f.325: 'Ce voyage que M. Rousseau faisait à Bruxelles était, disait-il, pour un établissement qu'on lui procurait en Flandres, Et qu'il allait en Hollande pour y faire imprimer ses ouvrages, dont le Sr Lenglet Dufresnoy voulait bien lui faire relire à Paris les exemplaires que Mr Rousseau devait faire présenter à S.A.R. et aux Seigneurs de la Cour. Et ledit abbé entreprenait le même voyage...'.
 186. Arch.Etr., Corr.Pol., Autriche 140, f.99.

187. Letter Dubourg to Dubois, 7 Mar. 1722, ibid., ff.97-100.
188. Ibid., ff.325-6.
189. Letter 5 Dec. 1732, Correspondance de Jean-Baptiste Rousseau et de Brossette, ed. Bonnefon, ii, 127. Other assertions by Rousseau in the same letter, such as that he had served as intermediary for Lenglet in selling books to the Prince, are also proved untrue by evidence in the Archives Etrangères.
190. This piece, 42 pages in length, was eventually published in De l'Usage des romans: see Bibliography, 26.01.
191. See De l'Usage des romans, i, 'Eloge historique...', pp.20-1: 'Mais gardez - vous d'aller en Hollande, car vous savez les terribles ravages que ces Sages Républicains font à present contre ceux dont vous avez chanté les Amours. Le Placart ou l'Edit même qu'on y a dernièrement publié sur le crime de non-conformité en Amours paroît être fait directement contre vous'. Some, at least, of Lenglet's accusations were well founded: Rousseau was a notorious sycophant who did not hesitate to secretly undermine his most generous patrons, as he did in the case of Eugene (cf. Henderson, Prince Eugen of Savoy, p.246).
192. See above Chapter III, pp.128-9.
193. See 'Eloge historique', p.26, Note 1: 'C'est ce que Rousseau faisoit à Vienne, il alloit picorer de tous côtés des Nouvelles qui n'étoient pas encore meures, pour les dire à un Secrétaire qui les mandoit sur le champ à sa Cour, qui en faisoit usage'; also Note 2, p.27: '[Prince Eugene] étoit bien informé que Rousseau alloit à la découverte de Nouvelles secretes, pour en informer une personne qui sçavoit s'en servir'.
194. See Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France, vii(1900), 546-89; Bonnefon quotes at length many ms. letters relative to the affair, some of which were conserved in the Bibliothèque municipale de Chartres, ms. 1718, which was almost entirely destroyed during the second world war. Most of this material was, however, published in his edition of the Correspondance de Jean-Baptiste Rousseau et de Brossette, which also contains other letters relevant to the affair not quoted in the article. M. Bonnefon fails, however, to give any references for some letters from other sources from which he quotes. The article was obviously written as a 'defence' of Rousseau, but, nonetheless gives a useful and detailed account of the events as they occurred. There are, however, some minor errors on M. Bonnefon's part, as, for example, when he fails to show that Lenglet originally planned to publish the 'Epître' with the Marot edition, although some of the letters he quotes clearly prove this (see note 195). Where possible I have quoted references to both Bonnefon's article, abbreviated as Rousseau et Lenglet, and the Correspondance.

See also Lenglet's own account of the events relating to the suppression of the piece in Holland in the 'Avertissement' preceding the 'Eloge historique' (De l'Usage des romans, i).

195. See letter from Brossette to de Lasseré, 6 Sep. 1732:
'M. Rousseau me manda que ce libelle devait être mis à la tête d'un commentaire sur Marot, en quatre volumes in 4° qui parut alors sous le nom supposé du chevalier de Gordon de Percel, mais qui est véritablement de l'abbé Lenglet, et où M. Rousseau est traité en plusieurs endroits de la manière du monde la plus indigne' (Rousseau et Lenglet, p.558, also in Correspondance, ii, 109-11); see likewise letter from Brossette to the Marquis de Fénelon, 15(12?) Oct. 1733, Rousseau et Lenglet, p.578, (Correspondance, ii, 151-4), and letter from Brossette to the Président Bouhier, 16 Sep. 1732, Franç. 24409, f.395.
196. See letter from Brossette to the Marquis de Fénelon, Rousseau et Lenglet, p.578. Re Régner edition see below pp.213-5, and Bibliography, 25.01.
197. Claude Brossette (1671-1743) spent most of his life in his native Lyon. He was appointed 'Avocat au Parlement de Paris' as well as to the Lyon courts, and held a number of charges. Scholars and men of letters assembled at his house and formed an academy in 1700 of which Brossette was appointed Secrétaire perpétuel. He compiled works of erudition on matters of law, and the history of the city of Lyon, as well as his editions of Boileau and Régner, which were thorough and scholarly. He corresponded with many contemporary literary men, including J.-B. Rousseau and Voltaire. (See Biog. univers., v, 619-21)
198. See Rousseau et Lenglet, pp.549 ff..
199. Lenglet himself published this letter, in De l'Usage des romans, i (it follows the 'Eptre satirique').
200. Léopold-Charles-Philippe-Joseph, Duc d'Arenberg (1690-1754), 'descended from the house of de Ligne, had made his career as a general in the Emperor's army, but was also a well-known figure in French court and literary circles, having his own hôtel in Paris. He was one of Rousseau's most generous and faithful patrons, even in face of the poet's customary ingratitude (Biog.univers., ii, 171).
201. See letter De Lasseré to Brossette, 21 Sep. 1732, in Rousseau et Lenglet, p.558 (Correspondance, ii, 111-2).
202. De Lasseré was apparently a former Conseiller au Parlement de Paris, who kept up a correspondence with a number of literary figures, and was an intimate member of the d'Arenberg circle (See Rousseau et Lenglet, pp.556-7).
203. Letter De Lasseré to Brossette, 21 Sep. 1732, in Rousseau et Lenglet, p.558. The anecdote was soon known around Paris: cf. letter from Mathieu Marais to the Président Bouhier, in Ravaillon, Archives de la Bastille, xii, 146-7.
204. Letter De Lasseré to Brossette, 25 Sep. 1732, in Rousseau et Lenglet, p.559.

205. Letter 25 Sep. 1732 in Rousseau et Lenglet, pp.561-2
(Correspondance, ii, 115-7: the ms. original of this letter was salvaged from the fires, and is conserved in the Bibliothèque de Chartres, ms. 1718). See also Brossette's reply, Rousseau et Lenglet, p.563.
206. Pierre Desmaizeaux (1666-1745) was born in Auvergne, but died in London where he was a member of the Royal Society; he was a close friend to many writers, especially Bayle and Saint-Evremond, whose biographies he published, as well as that of Boileau. He was one of the authors of the Bibliothèque raisonnée des ouvrages des savants. (Biog.univers., x, 516-7).
207. See letter Brossette to Rousseau, 12 Dec. 1732, Rousseau et Lenglet, p.565 (Correspondance, ii, 128-33). Saint-Hyacinthe, the editor of the Journal littéraire, prudently refused to publish the letter.
208. Franç. 24409, f.39.
209. Cf. above, Chapter II, pp.75 ff.
210. See Bastille 12488, f.34, which is a letter giving permission for a 'Mademoiselle de la Marre' to visit 'l'abbé Dufresnoy' whenever he so desires. If this note does refer to Lenglet, he must have been freed by June 1733 when he was visited by Charles-Etienne Jordan: see Jordan's Histoire d'un voyage littéraire, p.116. It is much more likely, however, that this 'abbé Dufresnoy' is another person, who is again mentioned in the Archives de la Bastille in 1737 in connection with a sordid affair of false denunciations (10166, f.150), having been only recently released from prison.
211. See letter Brossette to the Marquis de Fénelon, 12 Oct. 1733, Rousseau et Lenglet, p.578 (Correspondance, ii, 151-4): 'On arrêta en même temps à la Haye, chez Oléander, l'impression du Régner et des remarques', i.e. late in 1732. Cf. Lenglet's letter to the Journal littéraire which must have been written before the suppression. Oléander was in fact operating in Amsterdam, not in the Hague (see letter Brossette to de la Ville, 12 Nov. 1733, Rousseau et Lenglet, p.581 (Correspondance, ii, 160-1)).
212. Cf. Barillot to Brossette, 11 May 1733, Rousseau et Lenglet, p.575 (Correspondance, ii, 146-9).
213. Barillot to Brossette, 12 Jan. 1733, ibid., p.569 (Correspondance, ii, 136-8).
214. Brossette to Fénelon, 12 Oct. 1733, ibid., p.578 (Correspondance, ii, 151-4): 'Mais j'apprends aujourd'hui que l'on vient de reprendre cette malheureuse édition et qu'elle doit bientôt être publiée, si Votre Excellence n'a la bonté de l'empêcher'. See also Brossette to Rousseau, 15 Oct. 1733, ibid., p.579 (Correspondance, ii, 155-7).
215. De la Ville to Brossette, 26 Nov. 1733, ibid., p.582 (Correspondance, ii, 161-3).

216. Cf. Barillot to Brossette, 2 Feb. 1734, ibid., p.584, and 5 Mar. 1734, ibid., p.585 (Correspondance, ii, 175-8). See Bibliography, 26.01, and below pp.223-4, re the police reaction to the publication of De l'Usage.
217. Letter to Bouhier, 31 Mar. 1734, Franç. 24414, ff.510-11.
218. See de Lasseré to Brossette, 17 Mar. 1734, Rousseau et Lenglet, pp.586-8 (Correspondance, ii, 178-81).
219. Cf. J. Oudart and J. Sgard, 'La critique du roman', Presse et histoire au XVIIIe siècle. L'Année 1734, Paris, C.N.R.S., 1978, p.271.
220. See letter Brossette to Brumoy, 26 Mar. 1734 (Correspondance, ii, 182), and also letter 30 Mar., ibid., ii, 183-5.
221. See below, pp.227-9.
222. Bibliothèque française, xxiii(1736), 153. According to Michault it was Voltaire himself who drew Lenglet's attention to the insult in a letter dated 18 Oct. 1736 (Mémoires, p.218).
223. Letter Rousseau to Brossette, 20 Oct. 1739, (Correspondance, ii, 234-5).
224. There are innumerable references to the affair in their correspondence: see for example Bouhier's letters to Marais, Franç. 25542, ff.79 and 83, and Marais to Bouhier, Franç. 24414, ff.510-1.
225. See Bibliography, 25.01.
226. Correspondance, ii, 173.
227. See Satires et autres oeuvres de Régnier, 'Avertissement', p.vii.
228. Lenglet was possibly even thinking of republishing the two works together. The Président Bouhier remarked in a letter: 'Pour l'Abbé Lenglet, s'il fait reimprimer le Cabinet satyrique avec le Regnier, il ne me surprendra point. Il aime à remuer les ordures, et c'est un vrai gadouard en fait de Littérature (Bouhier to Caumont, 3 May 1735, Nouv.acq.franç. 4384, f.118).
229. Mémoires, p.171.
230. Ibid., p.173.
231. See ibid., p.171.
232. See letter from Barillot to Brossette (Rousseau et Lenglet, p.575), where it is asserted that Lenglet was dealing directly with the printer Oléander, without using a publisher as intermediary (see further refs.: ibid., pp.565, 579, and 581).
233. See below Chapter VI, pp.420 ff, re his publication of the Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc.

234. See copy in the B.N., Rés.Y²1214, p.24.
235. See Bibliography, 26.01.
236. See above p.211 , and Bibliography.
237. Preface, in t.i. of De l'Usage des romans.
238. See Georges May, Le Dilemme du roman au XVIIIe siècle, étude sur les rapports du roman et de la critique (1715-61), Paris/Connecticut, P.U.F., 1963, p.75.
239. New York, Wilson, 1939, p.xiv and pp.44 ff.
240. See De l'Usage des romans, Preface, t.i. (no pagination).
241. See ibid., pp.52 ff.
242. Ibid., pp.2-3.
243. Ibid., pp.4-5.
244. May, op.cit., quotes and analyses the typical condemnations of novels which were current in this period (Introduction and Chapter I).
245. De l'Usage, p.51.
246. On the relationship between history and novel-writing in the early eighteenth century, and on the contemporary views of the relationship between the classical epic and the novel, see Georges May, 'L'Histoire a-t-elle engendré le roman?' in Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France, lv(1955), 155-76, and Le Dilemme, Chapter V.
247. De l'Usage, pp.54-61. May, however, points out that a large percentage of the novels of this period claim to be authentic 'Mémoires' based on historical evidence: one need only think of Prévost or Marivaux to illustrate the point. Paul Hazard has pointed to the 'pyrrhonisme historique' which Lenglet expresses here and in his Méthode pour étudier l'histoire as a manifestation of the contemporary 'crise de la conscience' (see La Crise de la conscience européenne, i, 39-40).
248. De l'Usage, pp.81-2.
249. See May, Le Dilemme, pp.124 ff. Lenglet's sincerity in this line of argument is obviously questionable; more convincing and more original is a contradictory argument which he uses in Chapter VI, that ignorance of the pitfalls of love is no protection for young people, and it is therefore desirable that they should be shown those dangers in novels in order to recognize and avoid them in real life (De l'Usage, pp.289-91; cf. May, Le Dilemme, pp.131 ff.).
250. Méthode pour étudier l'histoire, 1729 ed., i, 483-4 (cancellandum).

251. De l'Usage, pp.83- 4. Cf. May, Le Dilemme, p.236.
252. De l'Usage, p.116.
253. Georges May touches on one aspect of this question in 'L'Histoire a-t-elle egendré le roman?', pp.169-70. See also Le Dilemme, pp.142-3, where May underlines the value of this chapter where Lenglet dwells on the relationship between novels and history: 'Or ces rapports constituent peut-être l'élément le plus caractéristique du développement contemporain du roman; la plupart des romanciers s'en sont rendu clairement compte et se sont exprimés à ce propos. Mais Lenglet-Dufresnoy, lui, est une sorte d'exception parmi les critiques. S'il n'a donc pas toujours vu très clair sur les tendances réalistes des meilleurs romanciers de son temps, il faut en revanche admirer la sûreté de jugement qui lui a permis de sentir plus ou moins confusément que la question des rapports du roman et de l'histoire était d'importance prédominante'.
254. De l'Usage, i, 208.
255. Cf. May, Le Dilemme, p.56.
256. Oudart and Sgard, 'La critique du roman', p.273.
257. Ibid.
258. Ibid.; see De l'Usage, pp.212-3.
259. De l'Usage, Chapter VII.
260. 'J'avois besoin de m'égayer', he stated.
261. Daniel Mornet, commenting on the popularity of De l'Usage, emphasises that 'cela a son poids si la Bibliothèque qui fait son second volume consacre 46 pages aux romans de chevalerie et qu'ainsi se prépare ou se confirme ce retour aux antiquités nationales dont le romantisme fera son trophée' ('Les Enseignements des bibliothèques privées', Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France, xvii(1910), 470-1).
262. The 'sçavant de mes amis' to whom Lenglet refers here may well be Charles-Etienne Jordan from Berlin, descendant of exiled Protestants from Dauphiné, who went on a 'voyage littéraire' in 1733 and visited the abbé on 20 June of that year. In his accounts of that visit Jordan states: 'Il [Lenglet] est sur le point de publier un Ouvrage intitulé de l'Utilité des Romans, avec un Catalogue raisonné de ceux qu'il a lûs. Mr. Richey, & moi, en avons vû les Sommaires. Il nous paroît que cet Ouvrage sera bon: nous remarquâmes, cependant, que les Romands Allemands lui sont peu connus'. (Histoire d'un voyage littéraire, fait en 1733 en France, en Angleterre, et en Hollande, The Hague, Moetiens, 1735, p.117). Lenglet would apparently not have bothered to inform himself on the subject were it not for this chance visitor.

263. Lenglet did have a good knowledge of Italian which he was to teach to the Archbishop of Sens in the 1750's (see Vat.Lat..9813, f.50), and probably also read Spanish (cf. the work he did on Spanish archives for the Marquis de Santa-Cruz).
264. Cf. below, the published criticisms of the work, and Lenglet's quarrel with Prévost.
265. See Bibliography. On the typical compositorial practices in the different European countries see R.A. Sayce, 'Compositorial Practices and the Localization of Printed Books, 1530-1800', The Library, xxi(1966), 1-45, and Giles Barber, 'Catchwords and Press Figures at home and abroad', The Book Collector, ix(1960), 301-7.
266. Mr. Barber (op.cit.) points specifically to the practice of the Rouen printers of using catchwords on every page to give their books a foreign appearance.
267. See P. Bonnefon, 'Rousseau et Lenglet', p.585. See also La Bibliothèque française, xxi, 130, which gives Rouen as the place of publication.
268. See de Beaumont, 'Mort de l'abbé Lenglet', L'Année littéraire, 1755, p.126. This incident is indirectly reported in the Journal de Trévoux of Feb. 1734: 'Aussi Mr. **** qui a eu le malheur de passer pour l'Auteur de ce mauvais Ouvrage, s'inscrit-il en faux contre le Public. Aux preuves bonnes ou mauvaises, que certaines personnes prétendent avoir en main, il en oppose une autre qui doit paroître sans réplique: c'est qu'il se dispose à mettre au jour une Critique en forme, pour servir de contrepoison à un Livre si contagieux. Il pourroit s'en épargner les frais, si son honneur et sa religion n'y étoient pas intéressés. L'indécence d'un pareil ouvrage se fait assez sentir, sans qu'il soit besoin d'emprunter le secours de la critique' (pp.373-4). See also Michault's account of the incident, Mémoires, pp.111-2.
269. See Correspondance littéraire du Président Bouhier, ed. Duranton, vi, 51-2.
270. Franç. 24414, f.515.
271. Franç. 25542, f.211.
272. Marais to Bouhier, 31 Mar. 1734, Franç. 24414, ff.510-1.
273. Marais to Bouhier, Franç. 24414, f.515.
274. L'Année littéraire, 1755, p.126.
275. Marais refers here to Lenglet's remarks on the subject of the supposed 'Papesse Jeanne' on pp.88-94: the abbé holds that since accounts concur to prove that she was a good Pope in areas other than her private morality the church should be proud to admit her existence. It would be to its honour to show that an unknown young

man should have been elected to the papacy uniquely on grounds of merit (De l'Usage, i).

276. Lenglet's remarks on the Quietist affair, in which Bossuet accused Fénelon of heresy, occur in the context of an analysis of 'virtuous' and 'passionate' love, both of which, he states, aim at enjoyment of the love object; he continues: 'Vous sçavez le fracas qu'on a fait sur la fin du dernier siècle contre cet amour vertueux qui ne s'embarassoit pas de la possession. Combien de mouvemens ne s'est-on pas donné pour terrasser ceux qui sous les apparences d'une plus grande pureté en amour et d'un plus parfait désintéressement, vouloient aimer, mais non pas jouir. On a remué tous les ressorts de la raison, on a remué l'autorité de tous les anciens, pour montrer combien il étoit chimérique et absurde d'aimer sans desirer la jouissance: On a remué en France, on a remué à Rome, et l'on est enfin parvenu à chasser cet amour insensible; à prouver qu'il n'étoit rien moins que vertu, que c'étoit même une hérésie en amour, que d'en avoir sans aspirer à la possession de l'objet aimé'. Marginal note: 'Dispute de M. Bossuet et de M. de Fénelon' (De l'Usage, i, 236-7).
277. Marais to Bouhier, 31 Mar. 1734, Franç. 24414, ff.510-11.
278. Ibid., f.517.
279. Bouhier à Marais, B.N., ms. Franç. 25542, f.209.
280. Bibliothèque française, xix(1734), 178-80; ibid., xxi(1735), 130-8; Mémoires de Trévoux, Feb. 1734, 372-4; ibid., Apr. 1734, 672-95; Bibliothèque raisonnée des ouvrages des savants, xiv(1735), 405-22; Le Journal littéraire, xxiii(1736), 90-8; Le Pour et contre, iii(1734), 142-3 and iv(1734), 32-48.
281. Bibliothèque française, xix, 178.
282. Bibliothèque française, xxi, 131.
283. Ibid., pp.137-8; for the reply which Prévost did actually publish in his Pour et contre see below pp.231-3. Another virulent attack on Lenglet was made by the critic in the Bibliothèque raisonnée, who finishes with a very personal note: 'Il y a longtemps qu'il n'a paru de Livres où les bienséances aient été plus méprisées, la hardiesse de l'Auteur est d'autant plus étonnante que rien ne lui seroit plus avantageux que l'obscurité. Il est de son intérêt et de son honneur qu'on ne parle, ni de lui, ni de ses Livres; mais il y a grande apparence que l'honneur le touche peu: ce qu'il y a de triste pour lui, c'est qu'il est incorrigible' (p.422).
284. Mémoires, p.104.
285. Le Pour et contre, iii(1734), 142. It is likely that this article is not by Prévost, but by one of his contributors in Paris: cf. Prévost's own article in vol. iv, 32-48. Also approbatory, and most appreciative of Lenglet's brand of humour, is the critic in the Journal littéraire, xxiii(1736), 90-8, who remarks: 'Ses préceptes n'ont rien de dur et de sec, il les accompagne de réflexions

ingénieuses, il y mêle des faits curieux, son stile est libre, enjoué, et quelquefois un peu libertin' (p.92).

286. Cf. Graesse's judgement in his Trésor des livres rares et précieux, Dresden, Kuntze, 1859-69, iv, 161: 'La liste des romans laisse beaucoup à désirer quant à l'exactitude des titres'.
287. See anecdote illustrating Lenglet's extraordinary memory, recounted by Antoine Taillefer in his Tableau historique de l'esprit et du caractère des littérateurs français, Versailles, Poinçot, 1785, iii, 237 (reported in Delort, Détention des philosophes, 111-2).
288. Mémoires, pp.100-1. Cf. article in Le Pour et contre, iii(1734): 'La Bibliothèque des romans...n'est ni complete, ni exacte. L'Auteur cite plusieurs Romans, dont on sent qu'il n'a connu que le titre. Ses jugemens sur quelques-uns de ces Romans ne sont pas non plus fort sûrs. Il met au nombre des Romans des histoires écrites avec une fidelité scrupuleuse; et le Traité des Chats, qui n'est qu'une simple Dissertation; enfin il donne à des Auteurs vivans des qualitez qu'ils n'ont point, et quelquefois il altere leurs noms'.
289. Under the rubric 'Nouvelles d'Amsterdam', Mémoires de Trévoux, 1734, pp.372-4.
290. Ibid., p.373.
291. See ibid., p.374: 'A l'égard des infamies qui font le sujet du prétendu Eloge Historique, Mr. Rousseau est vangé d'avance par le mépris que les honnêtes gens ont conçu pour l'Auteur qui a dévoilé tant d'horreurs'.
292. Mémoires de Trévoux, 1734, p.693.
293. Ibid., pp.687-8. The condemnation of novels quoted here is taken from a review of La Princesse de Portien published in the Mémoires de Trévoux, Feb. 1703, pp.311-3.
294. Ibid., p.674.
295. Ibid., p.678.
296. Ibid., p.689.
297. Ibid., pp.693-4.
298. Ibid., pp.692-5.
299. See above, p.211-2, and Correspondance de Rousseau et de Brossette, ed. Bonnefon, ii, 181-94.
300. The attribution is made by Fr. Brumoy in a letter to Brossette, 25 Oct. 1734, Correspondance..., ii, 193-4. Guillaume-Hyacinthe Bougeant (1690-1743) became a Jesuit at an early age; he wrote a number of historical works, as well as polemical pieces on music and theology, and anti-Jansenist plays to be performed in the Jesuit

colleges. His most notorious work was an Amusement philosophique sur le langage des bêtes, published in 1739, for which he was exiled by his order to La Flèche. He contributed a large number of articles to the Mémoires de Trévoux. (Biog.univers., v, 205-6).

301. Oudart and Sgard, 'La critique du roman', p.272.
302. See below, pp.234-5.
303. Oudart and Sgard, op.cit., p.272; on the subject of the proscription des romans see May, Le Dilemme, pp.75 ff.
304. Bibliothèque des romans, p.103.
305. Ibid., p.116.
306. Ibid., p.360. Re the actual events in Prévost's life on which Lenglet's remarks are based see Jean Sgard, Prévost romancier, Paris, Corti, 1968, Parts 2 and 3.
307. Cf. Sgard, ibid., p.318.
308. Le Pour et contre, iv, 32-48. A first mention of Lenglet's work appeared in vol. iii of the same journal (pp.142-3), but this was probably written by a collaborator of Prévost's in Paris before the latter could procure a copy.
309. Cf. Sgard, op.cit., pp.317 ff.
310. See Le Pour et contre, iv, 45.
311. Sgard, op.cit., pp.303-4.
312. Cf. ibid., pp.304-5.
313. Le Pour et contre, iv(1734), 46.
314. Ibid., pp.46-7.
315. See above, p.188.
316. Le Pour et contre, iv, 47-8.
317. Prévost only, in fact, completed the first volume of the work: Histoire de ce qui s'est passé de plus remarquable dans toutes les parties du monde depuis 1545 jusqu'en 1607, écrite en latin par Mre Jacques-Auguste de Thou...Traduite en français et augmentée d'un grand nombre de passages considérables qui ont été retranchés dans les éditions latines. Avec des notes historiques, critiques et politiques, The Hague, Gosse et Neaulme, 1733. The Dedication is signed by Prévost.
318. See Le Pour et contre, iv, 48.

319. See copy annotated by Lenglet in B.N., Rés.y²1214, p.116. Lenglet made a further snide remark at Prévost's expense in his Supplément aux Mémoires de Condé (1743), p.x.
320. Mornet, 'Les Enseignements des bibliothèques privées, 1750-1780', pp.449-96; see esp. table, p.460, and p.470 where Mornet remarks à propos of De l'Usage: 'On l'achète plus que Clarisse et que les romans de Duclos'.
321. B.N., Rés.y²1214-16; it consists of the Bibl. des romans bound in 3 vols. with blank leaves between the printed pages. There are also some ms. notes added by Mercier de St. Leger at a later date. One of the more interesting of Lenglet's notes, on a novel entitled Mémoires de la Comtesse de Linska, published in 1739, refers to the change in the attitude of the censorship authorities to novels over the decade: 'A la fin la glace est rompuë, et M. le Chancelier Daguesseau, malgré l'austere vertu, qui lui faisoit rejeter tous les Romans, s'est enfin rendu et il a permis celui ci et quelques autres, qu'il a fait examiner suivant les regles de la plus severe morale, qui sert de regle a sa conduite toujours extrêmement sage et extraordinairement prudente' (p.120).
322. Bibliothèque française, xix(1734), p.180.
323. Michault claims that the work was 'réimprimé en Hollande avec la Justification de l'Histoire' (Mémoires, p.99) but I have found no copies to substantiate this assertion.
324. Paris, Le Mercier, 1735, 275pp.
325. Voyage merveilleux, pp.215-16.
326. Michault, Mémoires, pp.106-7. However, the critic in the Journal des savants (July 1735, pp.378-91) was not so harsh in his judgments, and thought that Bougeant's conceit was 'véritablement ingénieux'.
327. Bibliothèque des romans, B.N., Rés.y²1214, p.3.
328. See Bibliography, 27.01 and 27.02.
329. See Bibliothèque française, xxii(1736), 180-7; Journal littéraire, xxiii(1736), 98-104; Mémoires de Trévoux, July 1735, pp.1200-35; Observations sur les écrits modernes, i, 208-13.
330. Observations sur les écrits modernes, i, 209. The article is signed 'D', which almost certainly indicates Desfontaines as the author: the satirical tone is typical of his style.
331. Bibliothèque française, xxii, 181.
332. Observations sur les écrits modernes, i, 208 ff: Desfontaines does not spare our abbé whom he describes as an 'auteur connu depuis long-tems dans la République des Lettres par son érudition Bibliographique, par sa plume hardie et badine, et par la basse et naïve familiarité de son style'.

333. Bibl. franç., xxii, 186.
334. 1735, p.1201. Bougeant remarks that on the appearance of De l'Usage everyone recognised Lenglet's style: 'Chacun vouloit absolument reconnoître presque à chaque page son tour d'esprit, et cette maniere hardie de penser, qui caracterise, ajoutoit-on, sa methode pour étudier l'histoire'. Moreover, Bougeant points out, Charles-Etienne Jordan in his Histoire d'un voyage littéraire (The Hague, Moetiens, 1735) had reported seeing the ms. of 'De l'utilité des romans' when he visited the abbé, who was about to publish it.
335. Journ. litt., xxiii, 99.
336. Articles III, VI and VII of L'Histoire justifiée have been transcribed almost verbatim in Discours II, III, and IV of the Supplément.
337. See letter from Bouhier to Caumont, 17 Mar. 1734, Nouv.acq.franç. 4384, f.98.
338. Le Roman de la rose, p.i.
339. Letter Bouhier to Caumont, 12 Oct. 1734, Nouv.acq.franç. 4384, f.107.
340. Bibliothèque des romans, pp.234-5. Re this edition see Bibliography, 28.01.
341. Ibid., p.234.
342. The first references in Bouhier's correspondence after the work's appearance all date from July 1735: see Franç. 24410, f.98; 24411, f.247; 25542, f.312.
343. Le Roman de la rose, 'Paris' ed., pp.xlii-iii.
344. Gossman, Medievalism and the ideologies of the Enlightenment, pp.258-9.
345. Cf. Bibliography.
346. The critic in the Observations sur les écrits modernes (i, 247) remarked on this Preface: 'Si vous voulez sçavoir d'où l'Editeur a emprunté les faits historiques de sa Préface, je vous conseille de lire une lettre de M. des Maizeaux sur le Roman de la Rose, que vous trouverez dans le 5ème volume des Oeuvres de M. de S. Evremont, édit. de Hollande pag. 380'.
347. Bibliothèque des romans, p.234.
348. For example pp.xv-xx of the original Preface were completely suppressed in the 'Paris' edition. Cf. Michault, Mémoires, p.173 who says: 'Il y avait à la tête de cette Edition une Préface Historique et Critique, qui a été supprimée, et à laquelle on en a substitué une autre qui n'est pas à beaucoup

près aussi piquante: il s'est pourtant échappé dans le Public quelques exemplaires de la première'.

349. Letter Bouhier to Caumont, 6 Aug. 1735, Nouv.acq.franç. 4384, f.124.
350. Ibid.
351. Observ. sur les écrits mod., i, 241-55. Likewise in Le Journal des savants, Oct. 1735, pp.579-82, the critic comments on Lenglet's editorial technique, particularly his decision not to include too many variants, and concludes: 'Il nous a paru que le succès avoit parfaitement répondu aux sages mesures qu'il a suivies' (p.582). The abbé Goujet also discusses this edition in his Bibliothèque française, ix, 54ff.
352. Le Roman de la Rose ... édition faite sur celle de Lenglet-Dufresnoy, corrigée avec soin et enrichie de la dissertation sur les auteurs, ... de l'analyse, des variantes et du glossaire publiés en 1737 par J.-B. Lantin de Damerey, Paris, Fournier et fils, 1799.
353. See Gossman, op.cit., p.259 Note. The Arsenal copy in question is shelf-marked 8°B.L.8676.
354. Préface, 'Paris' ed., p.xlvii.
355. See Gossman, op.cit., pp.177-95.
356. See B.N., ms. Moreau 1558, f.31 seq., Sainte-Palaye wrote in his Introduction: 'J'y ai joint plusieurs mots qu'il y avait omis, et d'autres qu'il avait compris, soit par ce que je m'écarte quelquefois de son interprétation, soit pour d'autres raison particulières'.
357. Nouv.acq.franç.4384, f.124.
358. Journal des savants, Oct. 1735, pp.579-82. See also the compte-rendu of the Supplément in the Journal des savants, June 1737, pp.355-60.
359. Cf. above p. 182, It was known that Falconet had in fact been working on the Roman, as the abbé d'Olivet remarked in a letter to Bouhier in Oct. 1735: 'Il est certain que la nouvelle édition du Roman de la Rose est de cet abominable abbé Lenglet, auteur de tant d'autres mauvais livres, et auteur de tant d'actions encore plus mauvaises. Il y a vingt ans que M. Falconet travaille à un commentaire sur ce roman. Mais il ne veut donner cet ouvrage que quand il publiera son dictionnaire gaulois, auquel il travaille sans discontinuation' (Correspondance littéraire du Président Bouhier, ed. Duranton and Lauvergnot-Gagnière, Univ. de Saint-Etienne, 1976, iv, 203).
360. June 1737, Franç.24409, f.405.

361. De l'Usage et du choix des livres (Prospectus), pp.1-2. (see Bibliography, 29.01).
362. Mémoires de Trévoux, Mar. 1737, pp.554-6; Journal des savants, 1736, p.854.
363. Histoire des Papes, depuis saint Pierre jusqu'à Benoît XIII, the Hague, Scheurleer, 1732, 5 vols.
364. See Barbier, Dictionnaire des ouvrages anonymes, ii, 760, and Gachet d'Artigny, Nouveaux mémoires d'histoire, de critique et de littérature, vii, 96; also Michault, Mémoires, pp.218-19.
365. 'Andrinople, Thomas Franco', 1734, reprinted twice in 1735.
366. See Félix Rocquain, L'Esprit révolutionnaire avant la Révolution, 1715-1789, Paris, Plon, 1878, p.87, and p.499.
367. Cf. Barbier, Dict. des ouvrages anon., iii, 1026,: the attribution was made by the abbé Goujet in his 'Catalogue manuscrit', conserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Dept. des manuscrits.
368. See B.N., Rés.y² 1214-6.
369. See above, pp.176-7.
370. See Bibliography, 13.03 . The major addition is the Géographie des enfants, discussed below.
371. Mémoires de Trévoux, Sep. 1737, pp.1569-70.
372. Principes de l'histoire pour l'éducation de la jeunesse, i, p.vii.
373. See Granet, Réflexions sur les ouvrages de littérature, i(1738), 297.
374. Principes de l'histoire, i, p.vii.
375. Observ. sur les écrits mod., viii(1737), 309.
376. The work in question is by M. le Ragois; the note is in vol.viii of the Méthode, 1729 ed.(12°), p.926.
377. La Bibliothèque française, xxv(1737), 184. Lenglet made a weak reply to this reproach in the Preface to vol. iv of the Principes, p.xxx. His method is further criticised in the compte-rendu of the 1740 edition of the Géographie des enfants, Journal des savants, Feb. 1740, p.86.
378. See Bibliography, 30.01 - 30.75.
379. June 1737, p.1526.
380. See Observations sur les écrits modernes, iv(1736), 213-16; vii, 272-81; Journal des savants, 1734, p.64; 1740, pp.86-7; Mémoires

de Trévoux, Feb. 1736, pp.382-3; Jun. 1737, p.1526; Sep. 1737, pp.1567-81; Oct. 1766, pp.168-70.

381. Mémoires, p.115.

382. Observ. sur les écrits mod., vii(1736), 138. In fact in vol.vi of the work Lenglet abandoned the 'question and answer' format as this was intended for older students.

383. See Bibliography, 31.01 - 31.05.

384. Journal des savants, 1736, p.697 and p.854; Mémoires de Trévoux, Nov. 1736, p.2492; Mar. 1737, pp.554-9, and Dec., pp.2228-39; Sep. 1739, pp.2006-23; Jan. 1753, p.190; Bibliothèque française, xxv(1737), 183-4; Réflexions sur les ouvrages de littérature, i, 295-8; iii, 206-13 and 256-64; iv, 136-44 and 324-8; viii, 211-16; Observations sur les écrits mod., vii, 136-42; viii, 306-10; xi, 160-5; xvii, 214-15.

385. Mémoires de Trévoux, Dec. 1737, p.2229.

386. See for example the Réfl. sur les ouvr. de litt., iv, 136ff., where the abbé Granet states: 'de tous les volumes qu'il a publiés, celui qui regarde l'Histoire de France, m'a paru le plus travaillé, et le plus conforme au plan qu'il s'est proposé'. This is not, of course, surprising in view of the abbé's special interest in the literature and history of France to which I have already referred.

387. Réfl. sur les ouvr. de litt., iii, 257.

388. The Jesuits were not slow to point out the 'slips' made by Lenglet in his Catholic zeal. They attack him, for example, for listing the notorious Histoire des Papes in his vol.vi: 'Enfin, suffisoit-il à un Ecrivain Catholique de dire[...] que l'Auteur a trop hazardé de Satyres, et que son Livre auroit été moins mauvais s'il avoit daigné être plus modéré. M. Lenglet du Fresnoy devoit-il faire connoître aux jeunes gens une Histoire, où les plus saints Papes et les plus respectables par leur doctrine, sont traités de la manière la plus indigne; une Histoire qui n'est qu'une invective, et une satire continuelle contre les Vicaires de J.C. sans avertir qu'elle n'est bonne qu'à les scandaliser?' (Mém. de Trévoux, Sep. 1739, pp.2011-12).

389. Mémoires, p.118.

390. Mémoires de Trévoux, Nov. 1737, pp.2002-27.

391. See Bibliography, 32.01.

392. Lettre à l'auteur des Observations, p.8.

393. Mémoires, p.121.

394. Paris, Barois fils, 1738, 104pp. According to Michault, this was just one of many brochures attacking the Méthode (Mémoires, p.92).

395. Mémoires, p.85; Matteo Egittio (1674-1745), son of a respected Neapolitan family, studied law, and held a number of public offices with such distinction that the Prince Della Torella invited him to go to Paris as his embassy secretary in 1735. Louis XV was so pleased with the Secretary's performance that he presented him with a gold chain. On his return to Naples the king, Charles de Bourbon, appointed him librarian of the Royal Library, and in 1745 bestowed on him the title of Count (Biog. univers., xii, 305).
396. Lenglet announced this work in his Lettre à l'auteur des Observations, p.21: 'Je conte dans peu faire paroître une réponse amiable à la Lettre d'un sçavant Napolitain sur ma Géographie, où j'aurai lieu de parler encore des très-révéréndissimes Journalistes de Trevoux'. The work is listed as 'Epître à Dom Mattheo Egittio, Bibliothécaire au Roi des Deux Siciles' by Hébrail and La Porte, La France littéraire, Paris, Duchesne, 1769, ii, 70. I have not found any copies of this work.
397. Mémoires, p.92.
398. See Relation de ce qui s'est passé..., 'Epître dédicatoire', 'Avertissement', and pp.2-3, 63, 79-94.
399. Ibid., pp.89-90.
400. The dedicatory epistle was signed 'L.D.', which could, of course, be Lenglet's initials.
401. Re the abbé d'Artigny (1704-68) see Dictionnaire des journalistes, ed. Jean Sgard, Grenoble, Presses Univ. de Grenoble, 1976.
402. Petit réservoir, i(1750); see d'Artigny, Nouveaux mémoires, i, 323 Note, and vii, 399-493.
403. T. vii(1756), 399-493.
404. Jean Sgard, Prévost romancier, pp.357-8.
405. See below, Chapter V, p.289.
406. See Nouveaux mémoires, vii, pp.72-3, 175-8 and 323-52.
407. See above Chapter I, p.8, and note 17.

CHAPTER V

1740-1749Financial insecurity: the backdrop to the later years

In 1740 Lenglet-Dufresnoy was sixty-six years old. His varied career had not brought him to any position of respectable security; as we have seen he consistently failed in his attempts to secure an ecclesiastical benefice, while the ambiguities of his character, his 'libertine' and dissipated turn of mind, and his general non-conformism precluded his being offered any of those posts or sinecures which emanated from the royal bounty. But he was not altogether without means, for he did have the pension given to him for the services he rendered the ministry in 1718-19 (reduced by one fifth in 1726, like all other pensions, to 800 livres per annum)¹, and some rentes sur l'hôtel de ville which would appear to have amounted to about 500 livres p.a., or possibly even twice that sum,² thus giving Lenglet a basic income of at least 1,300 livres p.a.; this was a reasonably sizeable sum when one considers that the pension accorded to a member of the Académie des Sciences at this time was 1,500 livres, and a Régent de Collège was paid 350 livres p.a. for full-time teaching. One might expect then that Lenglet would have made sufficient additional income from his dealings with the booksellers to ensure himself an adequate living, especially in view of the succès de scandale of many of the publications of the period we have just studied; and yet throughout the rest of his days debts and financial problems continually impinge on his life and work.

The reasons for this are difficult to establish. The abbé's lifestyle was not, by all accounts, extravagant: we have already met with references to the way in which he neglected his dress, and the accomodation in which he spent the last part of his life, if comfortably furnished, was modest. In 1739 he had moved from his old flat in the Marais to an apartment in a surgeon's house in the rue de la Harpe:³ it consisted of an antechamber, a small room serving as storeroom and library, a large study/livingroom, and a small bedroom,⁴ for which he paid a rent of 230 livres p.a.⁵ He had a gouvernante who looked after him: Lenglet did not apparently pay her any wages, but did pay for her room. One of the few references to this woman occurs in a letter Lenglet wrote to his sister from the Bastille during his last imprisonment: he relates that she has served him out of gratitude for a service he once rendered to a relative of hers, and he expresses considerable affection for her and concern about her future welfare.⁶ In another letter he refers to her as 'une bonne dame infirme'.⁷ He tells his sister that he had not wanted her to live under his roof for fear of scandal.⁸ Whatever her relationship to the abbé, whether housekeeper or mistress, this woman was not an onerous financial burden on him, for the rent of her room amounted to only 84 livres p.a.⁹ Moreover Lenglet, like Rameau's nephew, had a talent for having himself invited for meals by more affluent acquaintances: Michault tells us that 'on le recevoit avec plaisir dans plusieurs maisons',¹⁰ and a Mémoire, written in connection with an unpleasant legal wrangle c. 1740, gives us further details about the way in which Lenglet sought his subsistence. The writer of the Mémoire, Adrien Maillart, 'ancien bâtonnier de l'ordre des avocats' and a respected member of the 'robe class',¹¹ had known the abbé for fifteen years, and describes his

relationship with him in the following terms:

L'Abbé Lenglet s'est introduit chez M. Maillart, à titre d'Homme de Lettres, et usoit des cabinets en vrai Propriétaire...Par ses manieres officieuses, il s'étoit attiré la pleine confiance de la famille, et y mangeoit: il travailloit et s'endormoit dans les cabinets.¹²

Such an arrangement, which probably obtained in other households as well, must have been very convenient for the abbé: Maillart had a large house in the 'rue des Quatre-Vents, Fauxbourg S. Germain', and a fine library.¹³ Yet an apparently acute lack of funds prompted him to abuse the hospitality of the above unfortunate host.

Adrien Maillart had published in 1704 a learned Commentaire sur les coutumes générales d'Artois;¹⁴ in 1736 the good lawyer, now almost eighty years old, decided to publish a second edition of his work at his own expense, and not unnaturally asked the help of that veteran of the publishing business who was such a frequent guest in his house. Lenglet introduced him to a paper-merchant, a printer, a binder named Sauvage, and the bookseller De Bure, who would distribute the completed works on Maillart's behalf for a commission of 30 sols per volume. Approximately two years later the printed copy for the two large folio volumes was brought to Maillart's own house, and he entrusted the key to the store-room to Lenglet so that the latter could take a fixed number of copies, twelve at a time, to the binders. Maillart eventually learnt from Sauvage that our abbé had given him more than the agreed number of copies for binding, and on investigation found that Lenglet had distributed at least 72 copies at a 'sale' price to various booksellers around the town, with the obvious intention of appropriating the money for himself.¹⁵ The wily abbé had even tried to have extra copies of the table of contents printed secretly to add into his stolen volumes.¹⁶ In

response to Maillart's initial complaints Lenglet gave him a note on the 28th May 1740, promising to return 66 copies, but on the 10th June he had to write again saying that he had not been able to raise the money to satisfy Maillart - he no longer speaks of returning the copies - as even his sister Mme de la Barre was herself short of means and could loan him nothing. But he assured the aggrieved party that there would be money available to him at the beginning of August (presumably his rentes or his pension), and he added:

Jusqu'à ce que cela soit fini, je me prive de toute société, pour achever ce que j'ai commencé, il y a long-tems, et dont les valeurs, qui sont, comme réglées, vont beaucoup au-delà de ce que vous pourriez exiger de moi,¹⁷

presumably referring to some of those works which he was to publish during the following decade. Maillart, however, decided to take legal action to recover the copies from the booksellers named above, claiming that they were themselves accomplices in the theft, for they had no right to receive the copies from anyone but the author or the bookseller named in the volume, and they must have been aware of the fraud since the copies were offered way below the author's price of 27 livres minus 30 sols commission.¹⁸ The booksellers in turn decided to sue Maillart for defamation, and Lenglet, though his guilt was obvious from his interrogation, decided to brave things out and take similar action.¹⁹ We do not know what the outcome of the legal battle was, but we do know that the unfortunate Maillart ended up in serious trouble: his large house proved to have serious architectural problems and had to be partially rebuilt, which expense, together with the costs of the edition which failed to sell ('parce qu'il la voulait vendre trop cher' according to Denis-François Secousse),²⁰ led him into bankruptcy. He had to go into hiding to avoid arrest,²¹ and all his household goods and his precious library were put on sale in 1743.²² The shady side of

Lenglet's character, and his acute lack of funds, are amply demonstrated by this incident; in fact, such was the degree of his financial embarrassment that he even moved apartments secretly and changed his name in 1739 because he was 'accablé de personnes qui lui demandoient de l'argent' - presumably his creditors.²³

The text of Lenglet's interrogation gives us an insight into another area of his activities: he claimed that he had spent part of Maillart's money on a trip to Versailles 'au sujet d'un Canal, dont lui Répondant avoit donné le projet au Roy; et dans lequel projet ledit Me Maillart avoit été compris par lui Répondant'.²⁴ The lawyer denied being associated with any such project, but Lenglet's part in the affair is substantiated in a letter from an old friend of his, a clerk in Versailles named de Longuemare, to Déon de Beaumont who wrote the abbé's obituary for the Année littéraire:

Il m'a communiqué beaucoup de projets: entr'autres un pour l'établissement de charges de Gardes d'Archives dans les principales villes du Roiaume: Un pour la construction d'un Canal de Versailles à Sevre, et plusieurs autres moins utiles pour le public que ceux-ci, puisqu'ils ne tendoient qu'a faire entrer de l'argent dans les coffres du Roi, ou, pour mieux dire: des financiers, et à procurer des intérêts à leur Auteur.²⁵

Again one must pay tribute to Lenglet's inventiveness; it is clear that his primary motivation was self-interest - no doubt that a position of 'Garde d'Archives' would have suited him very well - but there is also an element of adventurous thinking and that desire for involvement in public affairs which we have already witnessed so often. He does not, however, appear to have had much success in convincing the royal administration as to the utility of his schemes, and he probably did waste his own resources in his efforts to procure a hearing.

The area where Lenglet concentrated most of his effort, as in the preceding decade, was that of publishing, and it is here that the pressures become increasingly evident. Over and over again in the period we are about to consider we find the abbé's financial problems evoked in relation to his literary output, and conversely we find that his astuteness in dealing with the booksellers has become almost legendary. We have already seen manifestations of his dislike and distrust of that confrérie, and we now continually see him trying to find ways of circumventing them: in 1753, for example, when his Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc is rejected by several libraires, he decides to go ahead and have it printed on his own account. He describes the hostile reactions of the booksellers in a 'Mémoire' to M. de Malesherbes, the tone of his remarks giving ample proof of his own antagonism towards them.²⁶ We shall also see below that shortly before his death he was trying to introduce into France the concept of a 'literary society' which would eliminate the booksellers from the publication of 'learned' volumes.²⁷ His reputation was commented on, no doubt with some restraint, by his biographer Déon de Beaumont in 1755:

Il étoit venu à bout de se rendre redoutable dans la Librairie: et ce n'étoit qu'en tremblant que le plus fin Libraire faisoit affaire avec lui.²⁸

Nonetheless there was one libraire whom Lenglet appears to have respected, and with whom he formed a close association at some time prior to 1740: this was Guillaume de Bure, one of a famous family of Parisian booksellers. After the death of Guillaume in 1748 Lenglet continued to work with his son Jean, describing him in 1752 as 'le plus honnête homme des libraires que je connoisse'.²⁹ The association appears to have begun around 1736, when the abbé contracted with de Bure for the publication of his Principes de l'histoire pour l'éducation de la jeunesse; from that time on the de Bure family was responsible for the publication

and re-edition of many of Lenglet's major works.³⁰ But the relationship was not confined to that of author/publisher; Lenglet was employed by de Bure on a fairly regular basis as a kind of editorial assistant, and in this capacity probably received a regular remuneration from the publisher. His work entailed the reading and correction of manuscripts sent to de Bure for publication, and research into possible future projects which the bookseller would then allot to chosen writers.

We have evidence of Lenglet's involvement in both of these activities primarily through the complaints of authors who accuse him of abusing his position. The abbé Gachet d'Artigny, a rather boring, pompous érudit from the Dauphiné, sent the first manuscript volume of his periodical Nouveaux mémoires d'histoire, de critique et de littérature to de Bure c. 1748;³¹ the publisher evidently gave Lenglet responsibility for the examination and correction of the work, whereupon the latter added in a Preface in which the unfortunate author was made to criticise his own articles, 'dont la plupart n'ont nullement les graces de la nouveauté'. He also added a large number of notes in the body of the work, and although d'Artigny was allowed to point to this fact in the published preface to the first volume, he was not so lucky in subsequent volumes where Lenglet actually inserted material of his own into d'Artigny's text without giving any indication of his interference.³² It was only after Lenglet's death that d'Artigny had an opportunity to decry this kind of editorial liberty and disclaim responsibility for the former's errors; he complained bitterly of his Parisian 'colleagues':

N'étant point sur les lieux, quand on imprime ces Nouveaux Mémoires, je ne puis connoître, qu'après qu'ils ont paru, les choses qu'on y ajoute; mais ceux qui font des supplémens, sans m'en avertir, devraient du moins les distinguer de mon texte par quelque note particuliere.³³

Very similar were the complaints made by J.-B. Michault, later Lenglet's biographer, who published an edition of the Lettres choisies de M. de la Rivière with de Bure in 1751:

L'abbé Lenglet[.] ayant été consulté sur le sort que pourroit avoir cette Collection, a jugé à propos, pour donner du relief au Livre, d'y ajouter un petit Avertissement de sa façon, et de placer dans le corps de l'Ouvrage quelques-unes de ses exclamations favorites, qui heureusement ne me sont pas familières. N'auroit-il pas mieux fait de m'avertir alors qu'il avoit déjà paru un Recueil de Pièces fugitives de différens Auteurs sur des sujets intéressans, où se trouvent les Lettres de M. de la Rivière et de Madame de Coligny.³⁴

The abbé d'Artigny also suffered in other ways from Lenglet's activities; in 1751 he had contemplated publishing an account of the supposed apparition of Soeur Alis de Tésieux in Lyon in 1527, based on a manuscript which he had found in the Jesuit College in that city. He had apparently sent his project to de Bure, including a reference to a rare copy of the procès-verbal in the library of the Sainte-Geneviève community in Paris, but as the matter fell within the province of the abbé Lenglet the latter replied that the work was in the course of being printed as part of a Recueil de dissertations anciennes et modernes sur les apparitions.³⁵ D'Artigny drew the obvious conclusions when he discovered that it was Lenglet himself who published this Recueil, and not with de Bure.³⁶ He was even more aggrieved about another very similar incident two years later when Lenglet blatantly plagiarised a manuscript 'Vie de la Pucelle d'Orléans' by Edmond Richer which d'Artigny had been commissioned to edit for de Bure; Lenglet deliberately rushed his Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc into print at his own expense, thus cutting the ground from under d'Artigny and his employer, de Bure.³⁷ Though Lenglet respected the de Bure as publishers, he was clearly not always fair and honest in his own dealings with them; it would be interesting to know what exactly were the terms of his contract with

them, but I have not located any of the publisher's records which might afford this kind of information.

Another rather shady aspect of the book-trade is evoked in an affair involving Lenglet and de Bure in 1742-1743. When the abbé Pierre Mathias de Gourné published a Géographe méthodique in 1741³⁸ he was strongly attacked by the abbé Desfontaines in his Observations sur les écrits modernes;³⁹ with typical rather venomous sarcasms the latter accused de Gourné of publishing another man's work under his own name. Shortly after this article the new edition of Lenglet's Méthode pour étudier la géographie was published by Rollin and de Bure,⁴⁰ and in the 'Discours préliminaire' the abbé reiterated the accusations made by Desfontaines. But de Gourné did not take the offence lightly, especially since his book was selling well, and had received warm praise from other journalists: he at once complained to the Chancellor, and published a pamphlet entitled Lettre de M. de Gourné, Prieur Commandataire de Notre-Dame de Taverny, auteur du Géographe méthodique, à Dom Gilbert, Bénédictin de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur, tant au sujet de cet ouvrage que du sieur abbé Des Fontaines⁴¹ in which he made serious charges against the last-named abbé. He claimed that he had approached Desfontaines on the occasion of the publication of his work, but Desfontaines, while showering praises on it, demanded a 'gift' of seven free copies plus four louis d'or in return for which he would publish a favourable critique of de Gourné's work. The author asserts that on his refusal Desfontaines made approaches to de Bure and Rollin who were about to publish the new Lenglet, or as de Gourné calls it the 'Martineau' edition, and they conspired between them to discredit de Gourné's work:

Il fut resolu que le sieur Guyot prépareroit incessamment le foudroyant morceau de critique qui' devoit faire tomber mon Ouvrage, mais qu'il ne paroîtroit qu'environ un mois, avant la nouvelle édition de la Géographie de Martineau, afin que l'Abbé Langlet pût faire usage de quelques faits que le sieur Guyot vouloit hasarder sur ma préface.⁴²

There is no proof to substantiate any of the assertions made by de Gourné. The tone of much of his account is rather fanciful, and clearly vindictive; his own character was not by any means above suspicion.⁴³ The booksellers named in the pamphlet denied having any dealings with Desfontaines, and took judicial action against de Gourné; Desfontaines himself denounced him to the Lieutenant criminel for distributing in France a pamphlet published in Holland. De Gourné then published the 'Requête' which he had presented to the Chancellor against Desfontaines and Lenglet: he pointed out that our abbé had not submitted his 1742 Géographie to the censor appointed to examine it, but had reprinted the old 1735 approbation and thus avoided any examination of his additions.⁴⁴ De Gourné and Desfontaines vied with each other in producing attack and counter-attack, but the former finally triumphed when on 6th September 1743 the affair resulted in Desfontaine's privilège for the Observations sur les écrits modernes being revoked.⁴⁵ Whatever the true facts of the affair it does appear that there was some degree of collusion between Lenglet and his publishers and Desfontaines, with the aim of promoting the former's Géographie; it is interesting to find these two redoutable and rather disreputable abbés, whose material circumstances are so similar, agreeing to promote each other's welfare. De Gourné incidentally informs us that Lenglet had contributed articles 'de mauvaise critique' to the Observations,⁴⁶ as he appears to have done to other journals, though unfortunately he gives us no help in identifying them.⁴⁷ In all, the affair seems to have attracted a considerable amount

of attention; J.-B. Michault concluded his account of it with the comment:

De Gourné fit des reproches sanglans, il est vrai, mais inutiles à ses deux ennemis, que les affronts ni la Bastille n'ont jamais pu corriger.⁴⁸

Despite all his schemes and machinations we shall see that Lenglet continued to have serious financial difficulties - whether due to speculation, family commitments, or otherwise - and it was primarily through his publishing endeavours that he tried to remedy them.

New departures: from Voltaire to occultism

The 1740 s were again a highly prolific period, opening with a strange and interesting project on the part of Lenglet and the publisher Gandouin. This concerned Voltaire's epic poem, first published in 1723 under the title of La Ligue, revised and reissued in luxury quarto format in 1728 with the new title of La Henriade.⁴⁹ The earliest mention of an interest by Gandouin in the publication of this work occurs in a letter from Voltaire to his friend Thieriot in October 1738, when the poet says:

La correction de la Henriade, entroit dans mes travaux. Lorsque vous m'apprenez le dessein des libraires, il faut m'y conformer. Il faut rendre cet ouvrage digne de mes amis et de la posterité. Mais Prault se disposoit à en faire une édition, il me faisoit graver. Il faudroit l'engager à entrer dans le projet des Gandouin.⁵⁰

Gandouin may have originally intended to produce a completely new edition: the reference to competition from Prault would suggest that he did.⁵¹ The main feature, however, was to be the additional material compiled by Lenglet-Dufresnoy.⁵² The project may in fact have originated with the latter, who, as we have seen, felt a special admiration for the

poet. The 'Additions' consisted of the variants Lenglet had collated, principally from the editions of 1723 and 1737, together with any notes to the text which Voltaire had previously published; to these Lenglet added his own notes which were mostly on points of history, but of which a few were of a more literary nature, criticising, for example, Voltaire's decision on a change of text. He also included the Prefaces which had appeared since 1728, and he translated into French the dedication to the Queen. All of this material formed a typographical entity separate from the text of the poem, as the editor was at pains to point out:

Mes Additions sont disposées de maniere, que ceux qui voudront les faire relire, à la fin de chaque Chant, le pourront aisément, ayant toujours fait imprimer par Cahiers détachés les observations qui regardent chaque Chant en particulier.⁵³

In fact it is clear from some of the editor's remarks that a new edition of the text itself was no longer part of his project:

L'illustre Auteur de la Henriade ayant sçu que j'avois fait imprimer les differences sur la belle Edition de Londres, m'a communiqué genereusement les nouvelles corrections, qu'il a faites à son Poëme; me laissant la liberté d'en faire l'usage que je jugerois à propos. J'ai cru qu'en les publiant je pouvois assurer le Public, qu'il promet de ne plus retoucher à son Ouvrage,⁵⁴

which 'corrections' are listed separately, and not incorporated into the poem. A cursory examination of the edition shows that the text of the poem itself is printed on different, better quality paper, and in a totally different typographical style from that of the 'Additions'; the presence of press-figures indicates that it was printed in England.⁵⁵ Lenglet throws some light on its origins in an 'Addition' for the Preface of 1737 which was printed at the end of his notes:

L'Auteur enfin a promis aux Libraires, auxquels il veut bien faire présent de cette Edition, qu'il ne feroit plus désormais aucune correction à son Poëme.⁵⁶

Thus Voltaire was himself involved in the production of this edition:

it was he who supplied the text of the poem, which was a partial re-printing of his subscriber edition put together c. 1733,⁵⁷ along with his list of recent corrections. He also gave Gandouin some of the plates from the 1728 quarto which he had recovered from London, and which the latter used in the printing of the additions.⁵⁸ It is impossible to establish the number of copies of the text which Gandouin received, but we know that he printed his section in an edition greater than that number, and sold it separately to people who already owned a copy of the 'subscriber' edition: there is for example one copy bound without the poem in the Bibliothèque Nationale, and another copy containing the 1728 'subscriber' edition in its entirety, with the title-page and additions of 1741.⁵⁹ Lenglet's name does not figure anywhere in the edition, which was purportedly printed in London; he may, however, have been given a permission tacite such as was accorded to Voltaire for the publication of the octavo edition of La Henriade in Paris in 1730.⁶⁰

The poet was no doubt flattered, as O.R. Taylor has remarked, by the status of a 'classic' which Lenglet's annotations conferred on his work.⁶¹ He retained most of the abbé's variants and notes in his edition of 1746, and even replied to some of Lenglet's remarks in a tone as courteous as that which the abbé had himself untypically adopted.⁶² Lenglet's 'Additions' were included, in variously adapted and abridged forms, in most of the editions published up to the 'Kehl' Oeuvres complètes of 1785, according to the whim of the individual editor.⁶³ His translation of the dedication was also reproduced in Marmontel's Preface to the 1746 edition, which was in turn included in a number of subsequent editions.⁶⁴

The opening years of the decade also saw the publication of two works in yet another new field by the enterprising abbé: that of alchemy. The first of these was a new edition of Guillaume Salmon's Bibliothèque des philosophes chimiques,⁶⁵ a collection of essays published in 1672 by the Parisian doctor who was himself an ardent alchemist, augmented by a number of other treatises whose publication Lenglet justifies in his 'Avertissement':

Les Amateurs de la Science Hermétique ne pouvant rassembler chacun en particulier les Ecrits des meilleurs Auteurs qui en ont traité, à cause que les Editions, qui en ont été faites séparément, et en différens temps, se trouvent maintenant dispersées dans nos Provinces et chez les Etrangers, et que les Exemplaires en étant devenus fort rares et très-chers, on a cru qu'on leur épargneroit des soins et de la dépense, en ajoutant, dans une nouvelle Edition, aux Adeptes, que M. Salomon a insérez dans sa Bibliothèque..., ceux auxquels il auroit pû y donner place, si sa santé lui avoit permis de la continuer.⁶⁶

Lenglet republished Salmon's preface with minor changes, including a number of pious remarks on the necessity of God's inspiration in the conduction of the alchemical experiments, which he presumably felt were necessary to appease the censors and avoid possible reproaches of irreligion;⁶⁷ and he added his own notes to the pieces. The edition was initially composed of three volumes, but a fourth was published in 1754 composed of rare or unpublished essays assembled by Lenglet; oddly, however, he had by then already published one of the principal pieces, the Philalèthe mentioned on the title-page, in another work.⁶⁸ On the appearance of this volume the Année littéraire commented: .

Les Auteurs de ces différens écrits promettent tous qu'ils seront plus clairs et plus sensés que leurs prédécesseurs; et ce sont toujours les mêmes folies et le même galimathias. Tous ces divers morceaux méritent cependant d'être recueillis et conservés, tant à cause de leur singularité, que pour faire voir jusqu'où va quelquefois le délire de l'esprit humain,⁶⁹

which would suggest that the subject was still potentially of interest to an educated, if sceptical, public. This fourth volume was apparently

published only in 500 copies, half the size of the edition of the first three volumes, and is correspondingly rare.⁷⁰ Lenglet's edition of the Bibliothèque was published anonymously, as was the sister work, an Histoire de la philosophie hermétique published in Paris by Coustelier in 1742.⁷¹ This was in three volumes, of which the first was devoted to Lenglet's history of alchemy up to his own time, drawn from a wide variety of sources; the second to a famous treatise on the transmutation of metals known as Le Vérable Philalèthe,⁷² with an editorial commentary by the abbé; and the third to a catalogue of the works of the alchemists. The preface to volume I is a model of Lenglet's favoured style: facetious, ironic, incisive at some points, very obscure at others. Once again he informs us, as he had done in the preface to De l'Usage des romans, that the work is the fruit of one of his imprisonments - 'ce travail m'a fait passer agréablement un tems de retraite, où tout autre se seroit fort ennuyé',⁷³ - to which the journalist in the Bibliothèque française sarcastically retorts that it is not therefore surprising that he should have chosen such a 'romanesque' subject.⁷⁴ Lenglet openly, not to say aggressively asserts that his work is one of vulgarisation, aimed at a general, not a scholarly public:

Peut-être trouvera-t-on que je n'ai pas extrêmement approfondi le Sujet que je traite, et que j'aurois pû le charger d'un grand nombre de citations Grecques et Latines, qui auraient plû aux Sçavans, et qui auroient fatigué les personnes de goût; mais j'ai rompu la glace, et j'espère que quelqu'un pourra finir ce que je ne fais qu'ébaucher. Qu'un autre plus habile et plus laborieux cherche donc à ennuyer le Public par des Compilations de passages; pour moi je suis content d'instruire, et de le faire d'une manière claire et succincte; c'est ce qui m'a porté à me resserrer autant qu'il m'a été possible; si je n'en ai point assez dit pour les Sçavans, il y en a plus qu'il ne faut pour les gens du monde, qui ne seront pas fâchés de connoître les illustres fous, qui se sont jettés dans les égaremens, dont j'écris l'Histoire.⁷⁵

In introducing his volume III he elaborates on his perception of his reading public, giving us an amusing ironical account of the conversation in those second-class salons which he frequented:

Dans le siècle où nous sommes on aime à lire superficiellement; mais on veut sçavoir du moins les titres de beaucoup de Livres. On ambitionne de connoître la rareté des uns pour en orner son cabinet, comme on feroit d'une porcelaine curieuse; on cherche à s'assurer de la bonté des autres pour les parcourir legerement; on ne veut pas même ignorer quels sont les mauvais Ecrivains, pour se donner dans le monde un air de Sçavant, en disant: ne lisez point celui-ci, c'est un Auteur médiocre; attachez-vous à celui-là comme j'ai fait; il est bon, j'en suis content: pour cet autre il est trop rare pour le conseiller; cependant j'ai eu le bonheur de le trouver et de m'en saisir. Voilà le goût du siècle. Hé-bien je le satisfais par les Trois parties de mon Ouvrage.⁷⁶

He accepts gaily - with an eye to his profit - the changes in taste which the scholars of the robe class, his contemporaries, found so devastating. The criticisms of the scholars of the Bouhier circle were, moreover, couched in just such terms as Lenglet had predicted, as for example in this letter from Bonardy to Bouhier:

Le fameux M. Lenglet du frenoy a publié il y a environ 2 mois une Histoire de la pphie. hermetique en 3 vol. in 12. mais croquée, à son ordinaire, et ou on ne trouve souvent, au lieu d'anecdotes, ou de recherches Litteraires, que des reflexions morales, tantost serieuses, et tantost ironiques, la plupart fort triviales.⁷⁷

The ambiguity of Lenglet's treatment of his subject, both in the preface and throughout the work, did not escape his critics; although he repeatedly uses deprecatory terms to describe the alchemists, as when he speaks in his preface of 'les illustres fous', at other points he appears to share the interests of the 'philosophes hermétiques', and to accept as true their accounts of the transmutation of metals. All of the journalists decry this ambiguous approach:

Il est vrai que de tems en tems, il insinuë que cette Philosophie hermétique est fausse, chimérique et ruineuse. Mais il nous la représente plus souvent comme une science sublime, et comme un art admirable, et le grand-oeuvre comme une chose réelle. Ensorte qu'il n'est pas aisé de sçavoir ce que l'Auteur pense de cette transmutation métallique, que la physique moderne juge impossible. Il prend quelquefois la peine de réfuter ce qu'on oppose aux vains arguments des Alchimistes. S'il est partisan de la philosophie hermétique, il n'en dit pas assez, et s'il la méprise, son mépris n'est pas assez marqué: il dit tantôt le pour, et tantôt le contre; ce qui n'est pas agréable à tous les lecteurs.⁷⁸

The Bibliothèque raisonnée adds maliciously:

Cela n'est pas étonnant de sa part, il a déjà fait la même chose par rapport aux Romains. ⁷⁹

Nonetheless it must be recognised that at the end of volume II, which is devoted to accounts of supposed transmutations of metals, Lenglet does publish a paper which Etienne-François Geoffroy read to the Académie des Sciences in Paris 'pour faire connaître les différentes Supercheries dont se servent ceux qui prétendent avoir la Pierre Philosophale', ⁸⁰ and which receives high praise in the journals. But Lenglet is criticised heavily for persistently confusing the terms 'chimie' and 'alchimie':

Se qui surprend ici davantage, est [...] le peu d'attention à distinguer la vraie et la fausse Chimie. Dans le Catalogue des ouvrages composez par les extravagans Alchimistes, on a inséré d'excellens écrits sur la Chimie raisonnable, qui est une des grandes parties de la physique, et qui est si utile pour la Médecine. N'est-il pas bien glorieux pour les sçavans Chimistes de notre Académie des Sciences, et de la Société royale de Londres, de grossir le nombre des foux, qui ont cultivé la chimie hermétique. ⁸¹

Lenglet in fact asserted in his 'Avertissement' to the 'Catalogue des philosophes hermétiques' that he had searched through both the Mémoires de l'Académie Royale des Sciences, and the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society for their 'opérations chimiques'; ⁸² he had even gone as far as to write to Sir Hans Sloane, President of the Royal Society, to ask him for additional information. ⁸³ These confusions are not surprising when one realises that Lenglet also practised indiscriminately the 'art' of alchemy and the 'science' of chemistry. It transpires that his brother, 'M. de Percel', who was living in Brussels, had been a close associate of a famous, not to say infamous, alchemist named Aluys; ⁸⁴ Lenglet claims that his brother had succeeded in transmuting 14 ounces of mercury into gold, which had then been

stolen by Aluys.⁸⁵ It is clear that Lenglet himself believes this story; it need not then surprise us when his contemporary biographers tell us that 'l'on prétend même qu'il cherchait la Pierre Philosophale'.⁸⁶ At the same time he had a lively interest in all aspects of chemistry, and carried out his own experiments. He did not, however, dissociate these from his alchemical operations, for in 1751 he published two volumes containing many of his own experiments as a supplement to his edition of Nicolas Le Fèvre's Cours de chimie,⁸⁷ and these are undoubtedly the operations to which he refers in the Philosophie hermétique as a possible supplement to the Philalèthe:

Si j'avois crû leur faire plaisir j'y aurois ajouté [...] un grand nombre d'operations sur les seuls métaux, toutes extrêmement curieuses et fort utiles par les remedes qu'on en peut tirer, dont quelques-uns sont plus connus par leurs effets, que par leurs préparations. Peut-être y viendrai-je, si je vois qu'on les demande.⁸⁸

The inventory taken after the abbé's death mentions a collection of glass bottles and stills which were evidently intended for these purposes.⁸⁹ He was particularly interested in medical preparations, and it was here that the confusion between the disciplines was most evident;⁹⁰ we have ample illustration in his correspondence with Cardinal Passionei of the kinds of remedies he applied to himself, and recommended to his friends. He also sent the Cardinal recipes for invisible ink which he himself made and used in his 'secret' correspondences.⁹¹ His potions were not always as successful as he pretended, as Déon de Beaumont tells us:

S'étant un jour purgé avec un sirop de sa composition dans lequel il avoit beaucoup de confiance, il devint prodigieusement enflé; il eut recours à une autre drogue encore de sa façon qui le rendit presque éthique.⁹²

He nonetheless survived his own treatment up to the age of 80.

Lenglet's interests and inconsistencies are, however, by no means unique,

even in these middle years of the century: Jean Ehrard has shown that even the confusion of the terms 'alchimie' and 'chimie' so decried by the journalists we have quoted was still very common in the texts of the period.⁹³ Much of the difficulty resided in the ambiguous identity of chemistry itself, on the one hand utilitarian, prosaic science of the artisan, blacksmith or pharmacist, on the other tending towards an esoteric systematism:

Science instable, mais aussi science obscure; malgré les efforts des disciples de Boyle ou de Lémery son langage est toujours encombré de mots et de symboles aussi confus que vagues. La diversité des définitions vient renforcer son caractère hermétique: science d'initiés, comme l'alchimie elle-même, et ce n'est pas leur seul point de contact. Tandis que le chimiste spéculé sur la nature et le nombre des 'éléments' des choses, l'alchimiste cherche à réaliser pratiquement leur transmutation. Entre leurs deux domaines les frontières restent incertaines: au milieu du siècle le maître de Lavoisier, Rouelle, ne manque jamais de terminer son cours annuel par une ou deux leçons sur le 'grand oeuvre'.⁹⁴

Not surprisingly the philosophes, with their emphasis on the experimental method and their rejection of a priori theories, hoped to purify the science of chemistry: Venel, writing in the Encyclopédie, aspires to see it elevated 'au rang de la physique calculée'.⁹⁵ Malouin, royal censor of books on chemistry,⁹⁶ wrote the article 'Alchimie' for the Encyclopédie. he suggests that the pretended science of that name is a latter-day corruption of the true science which the ancients had no doubt developed to a high degree of sophistication:

C'est la Chimie ainsi perfectionnée qu'on a nommée Alchimie. Cette science, comme toutes les autres, a péri dans certains tems, et il n'en est resté que le nom. Dans la suite, ceux qui ont eu du goût pour l'Alchimie, se sont tout d'un coup mis à faire les opérations, dans lesquelles la renommée apprend que l'Alchimie réussissoit; ils ont ainsi cherché l'inconnu sans passer par le connu: ils n'ont point commencé par la Chimie, sans laquelle on ne peut devenir Alchimiste que par hasard,⁹⁷

an interestingly rationalistic approach to the history of the science.

The 'philosophes' could then well gibe at 'philosophers' like Lenglet,

but, as Jean Ehrard underlines, one does not rail at dead beliefs, but at those which retain a minimum of vitality. Once again we find Lenglet vacillating at a turning-point in the intellectual history of the eighteenth century.

Lenglet underlined in his preface the historical dimension of his work, and asserted that he was issuing it 'comme l'avantcoureur d'un plus grand Ouvrage, auquel j'ai travaillé longtems; c'est l'Histoire de la Philosophie, des Philosophes et de leurs Opinions'.⁹⁸ Such a work never in fact appeared; Michault suggests that the abbé may have been discouraged by the good reception given by the public to a four-volume Histoire critique de la philosophie by André François Boureau-Deslandes published between 1737 and 1750.⁹⁹ As to his bibliography, Lenglet is at pains to point out in the 'Avertissement' the breadth of his sources: he had consulted the catalogues of libraries in Italy, Germany and Holland as well as in France, where he benefitted from access to the collections of the Bibliothèque du Roi, the library of the Maréchal d'Etrées, and principally that of M. Hellot of the Académie des Sciences.¹⁰⁰

The Histoire de la philosophie hermétique gained a certain notoriety for reasons unrelated to the nature of the work. Lenglet's foolhardy nature led him to indulge his taste for political satire in this most unlikely of texts: in a supposed portrait of Jacques Coeur, minister of Charles VII,¹⁰¹ he daringly lampooned the Contrôleur général des Finances, Philibert Orry.¹⁰² Lenglet accuses him, in extremely scathing terms, of abusing his position to embezzle the royal funds and build up his own commercial monopolies. He describes the hatred of the people for such a minister, taking care continually to generalise his

implications with remarks such as 'ainsi qu'il arrive toujours en de pareilles occasions'.¹⁰³ He makes his point explicit, however, when he states that Jacques Coeur was appointed in 1450 to 'l'administration générale des Finances, sous le titre de premier Argentier du Roi; qualité qui répond à celle de sur-Intendant, ou de Contrôleur général',¹⁰⁴ and goes on to describe the physical characteristics of Orry in what must have been an unmistakable portrait to anyone who had the least contact with the royal administration:

Un corps à demi voûté défiguroit une taille qui passoit la médiocre; une phisionomie très commune étoit accompagnée d'un son de voix grossier et desagréable, rampant bassement devant l'homme respectable; c'est-à-dire, devant ce sage et illustre vieillard, qui le soutenoit à la Cour, et qu'il trompoit grossièrement;¹⁰⁵ il faisoit payer au centuple à tous les Seigneurs, qui s'adessoient à lui, les marques de servitude, qu'il donnoit à son Protecteur. Dur et intraitable sur les besoins du peuple, il s'imaginait faussement, qu'on n'appercevoit pas, qu'il n'accumuloit tant de crimes et de monopoles, que pour enrichir une famille, qui ne méritoit pas même la fortune la plus médiocre. Il ignoroit l'art d'accorder des graces; jamais il n'en fit qu'elles ne fussent payées d'avance; son discours, qui étoit bref et concis, se terminoit à dire: cela ne sçauroit se faire; je ne le ferai pas; cela n'est point; cela est faux; je sçais ce que vous dites mieux que vous; ainsi on ne doit pas être surpris que la Providence, toujours juste, lui ait rendu ce qu'il méritoit.¹⁰⁶

One wonders what was the source of Lenglet's hatred of Orry: it would appear that his quarrel was with the function as much as the personality, for we shall see that in 1751 he was to be imprisoned for writing an anonymous letter, containing accusations of a similar nature, to Orry's successor de Machault.¹⁰⁷ His resentment was probably due to personal pique. One recalls those projects for bringing money into the royal coffers which Lenglet's friend de Longuemare described above: the abbé may well have presented them to the Contrôleur in power in the hope of a recompense for his efforts, and been refused. We have already encountered examples of the kind of spite of which he was capable on such occasions. It is surprising that he apparently escaped punishment for this

particular sally, for it certainly created some stir at the time.¹⁰⁸

Desfontaines maliciously pointed out the inappropriateness of Lenglet's comments as applied to Jacques Coeur:

Ce qui est tout à fait injuste, il en fait un concussionnaire et un voleur, contre le témoignage des meilleurs Historiens. Jacques Coeur fut un très-honnête-homme, extrêmement versé dans le commerce et dans la finance; ce qui lui procura bien des richesses et bien des ennemis.¹⁰⁹

Nor was the Administration unaware of Lenglet's audacity: there is an amusing account of the affair by Denis-François Secousse, who was appointed as censor for one of Lenglet's subsequent editions:¹¹⁰

Mr. d'Argenson, en me chargeant de cette censure, me dit en riant en sa présence que surtout je prisse garde aux portraits. Je n'entendis point ce qu'il voulait me dire; mais le bon abbé me mit au fait. Il a fait imprimer ici depuis peu, avec privilège, 3 vol. in-12 sur l'histoire de l'art hermétique. Il y parle de tous ceux qui s'y sont adonnés; et après avoir fait mention de Jacques Coeur, argentier de Charles VII, il ajoute qu'on ne sera peut-être pas fâché de connaître le caractère de ce financier; et là-dessus, il fait un portrait qui ne ressemble pas du tout à Jacques Coeur, et dans lequel des gens malins croient reconnaître une personne qui remplit une des plus hautes places. Le censeur royal, qui est un médecin et qui n'était pas obligé de savoir ce que nos historiens disent de cet argentier, a passé le portrait; celui auquel on l'applique, ou ne l'a pas su, ou l'a méprisé; et le livre se débite. '''

Lenglet was lucky that Orry was not as vindictive as his portrait of him would suggest.

The question of the censorship raises another problem: why did Lenglet not sign his name to this work, or to the Bibliothèque des philosophes chimiques? In fact, some copies of the former work did carry his name, those issued with a separate imprint, 'A la Haye, chez Pierre Gosse, Libraire, 1742'; these copies were presumably a special order for Gosse, and intended for distribution in Holland and the Netherlands. It would seem that public opinion in France, or perhaps even the administration itself, did not think it fitting for a man of the cloth to be associated

with such a subject. There is a copy of volume III of this 'Gosse' version in the Bibliothèque Nationale with corrections and additions in the abbé's hand:¹¹² he was evidently contemplating a re-edition of at least the 'Catalogue des auteurs'.

Simultaneously with this somewhat esoteric and religiously doubtful work Lenglet was preparing an edition of the missel, La Messe des fidèles, avec une explication historique et dogmatique du sacrifice de la sainte messe, et des pratiques de piété;¹¹³ this was the last in the line of evergreen works of piety which the abbé produced for publishers such as Durand, who specialised in 'Livres de dévotions'.¹¹⁴ It has a dedication to the Duc d'Orléans, in which Lenglet declares:

Je me trouve heureux, Monseigneur, de pouvoir aujourd'hui renouveler à votre Altesse Sérénissime les Voeux sincères, que j'ai eu l'honneur de lui présenter dans les temps de sa première Education.

He may perhaps have been introduced to the prince during the brief hey-day of Le Blanc's favour, but the subsequent contact was very probably limited to a request on Lenglet's part for permission to dedicate the work to the prince; he nonetheless boasted in a letter of 1748 that he was known to the Duc d'Orléans.¹¹⁵ Another work which was receiving Lenglet's attention at this time was his Méthode pour étudier la géographie, which was published in a new augmented edition in 1742.¹¹⁶

One of the additional pieces was a descriptive essay on the collection called 'Les Grands et les petits voyages', in a footnote to which Lenglet stated: 'Je dois toutes ces remarques à une personne également distinguée par sa naissance et par son amour pour les Lettres'.¹¹⁷ This was the abbé Charles d'Orléans de Rothelin,¹¹⁸ who had collected the rare and famous editions published in Frankfurt in 1590-1634.¹¹⁹ A

number of copies of the essay were printed separately on quarto paper, but from the same type-setting as the Méthode: only the pages at the beginning and end were altered.¹²⁰ The number of copies in this separate issue was very small,¹²¹ and were possibly intended only for de Rothelin's personal use and distribution: the two copies in the Bibliothèque Nationale belonged to him, and bear his manuscript annotations. De Rothelin seems to have preferred to remain anonymous, for it was only in the 1768 edition of Lenglet's Méthode, 24 years after his death, that he is identified in a note.¹²² Lenglet apparently wished to develop this aspect of the Méthode pour étudier la géographie, for Michault assures us that:

Il voulait pousser fort loin ses recherches sur les Voyages et les Voyageurs. Il en préparoit une Histoire complète avec une Bibliographie Critique des Ouvrages, et de Curieuses Observations sur les Auteurs.¹²³

He may have abandoned this project on the appearance of an Histoire générale des voyages, ou nouvelle collection de toutes les relations des voyages par mer et par terre, edited by the abbé Prévost and others, which was published in Paris from 1746 onwards.¹²⁴

Modern French history: major editorial achievements

It was in the early 1740 s that Lenglet became involved in projects for the publication of a series of texts relating to the history of modern France, some of which were to constitute his most respected, and most notorious, editions. In their conception and execution we find an interesting and highly ambivalent collaboration between the abbé and the scholars of the Académie des Inscriptions, eminently respectable

members of the robe and servants of the royal administration. Foremost among these was Denis-François Secousse (1691-1754), single-minded and respected érudit who had been one of Rollin's prize pupils at the Oratorian Collège de Juilly;¹²⁵ he had been elected to the Académie des Inscriptions at the age of 31, and had probably belonged to the circle of scholars from noble families who gravitated around the Comte de Boulainvilliers. He was also royal censor of books on history, for which charge he refused the customary pension: he enjoyed the access which his function gave him to all new manuscripts relative to French history. He was, in any case, a close associate of the Chancelier d'Aguesseau, to whom fell the responsibility of policing the book-trade, and was in familiar commerce with other influential personages at court.¹²⁶ Thus it was that some of his own scholarly researches were protected, if not actually instigated, by the government,¹²⁷ and it is in this context that we must view his relations with Lenglet.

Secousse was working on a new edition of the so-called 'Mémoires de Condé',¹²⁸ from 1738 onwards;¹²⁹ according to Michault, Lenglet was associated with the project at an early stage, in the guise of researcher/adviser.¹³⁰ The abbé himself, in a manuscript 'Mémoire' to M. de Malesherbes in 1754, describes the work in a list of his 'Travaux littéraires' in the following terms:

Mémoires de Condé travaillés de concert avec M. Secousse, le 6e Vol. est tout de l'abbé Lenglet.¹³¹

The working relationship between the two men is to some extent elucidated in a letter Secousse wrote some few years later, recounting a project to publish the works of the Président Jeannin:

J'ai été nommé censeur de cette édition. J'ai conseillé aux libraires de ne se point borner à copier les anciennes et d'enrichir la nouvelle de tous les ouvrages de ce grand homme qui n'ont point encore été publiés. Et j'ai fait lâcher l'abbé Lenglet pour fureter dans les bibliothèques du Roi, de Saint-Germain et dans quelques autres. Il a déjà fait des découvertes très importantes. Il doit incessamment m'en apporter le détail.¹³²

Not the least interesting aspect of this account is the degree of active intervention which it reveals on the part of the censor in determining the nature and quality of the projected work. It is highly likely that Lenglet acted in a similar capacity in the preparation of the Condé edition, seeking out interesting material which would be examined and sifted by Secousse, who, as an eminently respectable censor and academician, would not stretch too far the bounds of tolerance of the administration.¹³³

The nature of the material, relating to a relatively recent traumatic period of French history, was of course potentially incendiary; but the Chancellor d'Aguesseau was eager to encourage serious scholarship in the area,¹³⁴ even if he could not go as far as to give the royal

approbation et privilège to material which might engender criticism of the royal ancestors. The interested parties evidently accepted, to their mutual satisfaction, the formula of the permission tacite. The authorities would allow the work to be published in Paris by Rollin, provided certain external proprieties were observed: the censor would not be named, and the title-page would carry a London imprint, with Rollin mentioned only as distributor.¹³⁵

This was the system which was to be widely developed and applied under Malesherbe's^S direction in the following decade, but which had been in operation probably since the death of Louis XIV.¹³⁶ Secousse, for his part, was moderate in his choice of materials, and excluded from his edition some of the particularly vituperative tracts written during the religious wars, especially those from the Protestant side attacking the Catholic League and the Guise

family, and documents such as those concerning the trials of the two regicides Jean Chastel and François Ravallac; any attempt to explain or interpret their actions could be construed as subversive of the monarchy.

Lenglet-Dufresnoy was not as prudent. We have already seen that he operated on the fringe of the more conventional scholarly circles; he had an eye to the commercial success which the robin aristocrats could afford to scorn, and which was attendant upon the publication of the more 'sensational' material, coupled with a willingness to brave the risks of imprisonment, a familiar phenomenon to him. He undertook to publish a Supplément or sixth volume to the Mémoires de Condé, with which Secousse was not overtly involved; yet J.-B. Michault asserts that:

Le projet et l'exécution n'avoient certainement rien de difficile, puisque M. Secousse lui avoit ouvert ses riches Porte-feuilles, dont les morceaux qui forment le sixième Tome des Mémoires de Condé, ont été tirés. J'en ai vu moi-même plusieurs autres, corrigés et brodés de la main de l'Abbé Lenglet.³⁷

Michault is here ignoring the question of the extent to which Lenglet had helped to put the material together in the first instance, but nonetheless his statement must lead one to speculate on the degree of unacknowledged collusion between Secousse, royal censor, and the abbé, who could be used as a scapegoat in case of trouble. There was at least active encouragement of a man who, notoriously, needed little prodding to openly flout the censorship authorities. Secousse and his colleagues were anxious to have ready access to the kind of material Lenglet included in his Supplément, but their frustration on being deprived of it rarely led them to a conflict of principle with the royal authority; they were happy to be saved from any such necessity by the

cupidity of bourgeois abbés and publishers. The ambivalence, not to say dishonesty, of Secousse's attitude is evident in the letter he wrote to Bouhier announcing the Supplément:

On a fait imprimer un supplément ou 6ème volume, auquel je n'ai voulu avoir aucune part; et lorsque vous l'aurez parcouru, vous en sentirez aisément la raison. C'est Mr l'abbé Lenglet-Dufresnoy qui en est l'éditeur. Il y a rassemblé une vingtaine de pièces très curieuses, très rares et très chères, les légendes du cardinal de Lorraine et de D. Claude de Guise, l'apologie pour Jean Châtel, le procès de celui-ci et de Ravallac, et plusieurs autres pièces qu'aucun libraire n'aurait osé s'engager de fournir dans le cours d'une année pour une dizaine de pistoles. Vous jugerez, Monsieur, des notes qu'il y a mises. On n'est point obligé de prendre ce 6ème volume, mais vos amis de Dijon qui ont des souscriptions, ne doivent point balancer à l'acheter.¹³⁸

It is clear that Lenglet had made his own arrangements with Secousse's publisher Rollin, who, recognising a good investment, agreed to finance the project.¹³⁹ They proceeded without official sanction, printing the volume in semi-clandestinity, and obviously hoping to pass it off as of foreign origin;¹⁴⁰ but the Chancellor was informed of the affair, possibly through the protagonists themselves tardily applying for a permission tacite, and Lenglet was summoned to account for his work. In a copy of the Supplément at the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal I discovered a draft of a letter in Lenglet's hand which was obviously intended as a reply to the Chancellor's reservations. Because of the interesting light it casts on one writer's perception of the administration's standpoint in relation to this kind of material, and his expectations of a certain tolerance on the part of the Chancellor, the brouillon is worth quoting at length:

Sur les Memoires de Condé

Labbé Lenglet Dufresnoy ayant sceu que M Secousse faisoit une nouvelle edition des Memoires de Louis I. Prince de Condé.]crut que pour rendre cette Edition plus complete il pouvoit risquer d'y joindre un Supplement ou Sixieme Volume, qui contient les pieces les plus rares

et les plus singulieres du XVI siècle, qui n'entroyent point dans la Collection de M. Secousse[.] Comme [les quatre Principales pieces] faites dans des temps de troubles, renferment quelques maximes contraires a l'ordre public et a la tranquillité du Royaume, Labbé Lenglet n'a pas voulu les laisser reparoitre sans y joindre le contrepoison necessaire a leur lecture.

1° Quant à la Legende du Cardinal Charles de Lorraine piece tres belle et tres bien faite, elle attaque les vastes idées et les projets dangereux du Cardinal et des Princes de la maison de Guises, dont on a vu malheureusement les suites facheuses, predites dès l'an 1574 que cette Legende parut pour la premiere fois. Personne n'y prend aujourd'hui Interêt. Les Princes de la maison de Lorraine ne viennent point des Ducs de Guise, mais d'une branche collaterale. et c'est faire l'apologie de nos Rois, sur tout ceux de la maison regnante que de montrer les egaremens du Cardinal de Lorraine, de son frere et de ses neveux. C'est ce qu'on a fait par les notes qui accompagnent cette piece.

2° La Legende de Dom Claude de Guise regarde un prétendu batard du premier Duc de Guise, qui se fit moine et l'on confirme soit par des notes, soit par une lettre du Cardinal Pellevé tirée de la Bibliothèque de S.M. les mauvais deportement de ce moine. ainsi personne n'y prend interet, pas meme les Religieux de Cluny, dont il fut abbé.

3° L'apologie de Jean Chatel est la piece la plus mauvaise de ce Recueil; et celle sur l'impression de laquelle on pourroit le plus hesiter: mais on a trois observations a faire à ce Sujet 1° cette apologie quoique dangereuse se vend publiquement dans Paris et il n'est pas de Bibliothèque ou elle ne se crie à l'encan sans qu'on y trouve à redire. Or si cette piece toute nuë et sans correctif n'est point capable de faire du mal, elle en fera beaucoup moins accompagnée des notes que l'abbé Lenglet y a jointes pour en refuter les maximes dangereuses. 2° Labbé Lenglet ayant dessein de reimprimer depuis environ 2 ans La Chronologie Novennaire M Le Comte d'Argenson lui en demanda le plan, ce que l'abbé Lenglet fit verbalement, en marquant qu'outre les notes il y feroit entrer les pièces les plus rares du Regne de Henri IV et notamment L'apologie de J. Chatel sur quoi M. le Comte d'Argenson, qui a leu cette piece repondit qu'elle etoit trop forte et trop dangereuse; mais l'abbé Lenglet prit la liberté de faire connoitre qu'il ne la feroit point reimprimer sans y mettre le contrepoison necessaire; ce qui ne fut point désapprouvé par M Le Comte d'Argenson; et c'est ce que cet abbé execute dans cette Edition. 3° Labbé Lenglet scait et il en peut donner la preuve que des libraires françois devoient reimprimer cette apologie et ils l'auroient fait en libraires, c'est à dire sans y mettre le correctif necessaire: c'est ce qui a engagé cet abbé a les prevenir par une edition qui corrigeat le mal que ce livre pourrait faire dans les temps a venir.

4° Quant au Proces de françois Ravaillac; il fut imprimé a Paris en 1610 non seulement en un volume a part, mais meme dans le mercure françois Tome I, et comme on l'avoit fait fort imparfaitement l'abbé Lenglet a suppléé a ce defaut par les mss. de la Bibliothèque de S.M.

Les autres pieces qui accompagnent ces quatres principales n'ont été reimprimées que pour leur servir declaircissemens ou de preuves. Mais Labbé Lenglet les a toujours accompagnées de notes qui regardent le

Droit public du Royaume, notes par lesquels il met a couvert la personne de nos Rois et de leurs ministres; et ou il a soin d'expliquer les principes du droit naturel et des gens qui etablissent la tranquillité de l'Etat, et s'il a mis quelque chose qui souffre a cette egard une juste censure, il offre de se soumettre a telle peine qu'on voudra lui imposer. Il est seur de n'avoir rien dit qui puisse blesser les loix. Quoique seur de son fait il n'a pas voulu cependant publier les notes sans les communiquer auparavant a une personne exacte et versée dans notre Droit public.

L'abbé Lenglet espere donc qu'a cet égard on voudra du moins le traiter comme etranger: c'est a dire que l'on mette son livre a l'examen d'un homme habile dans le droit public de la nation et si l'on exige quelque correction elles ne pourroient etre que legeres il offre de les faire faire a ses depens, moyennant qu'on lui en permette le debit comme d'un livre etranger grace qu'on ne refuse pas meme a ceux qui ne sont pas regnicoles. ¹⁴¹

Lenglet's pretension that only the family of the Ducs de Guise could be offended by items 1 and 2 was patently hypocritical: the implications of the text were clearly far wider than the personalities involved, although personal grievances were admittedly an important consideration for the censorship authorities under the ancien régime. The most contentious item however was the 'Apologie pour Jean Chastel': the Chancellor seemingly did not accept that Lenglet's notes constituted a satisfactory 'contrepoison' to the piece, if indeed he accepted in principle Lenglet's 'counterbalancing' theory. He had good grounds, moreover, for questioning the good faith of Lenglet's offers, for even the 'Avertissement' to the work was not exactly anodine: despite the repetition of the terms of his letter regarding his editorial intentions,¹⁴² his condemnation of the fanaticism of the Catholic party and of the royal family's role in the Saint Bartholomew's Day massacres are clearly more outspoken than the administration would be likely to tolerate.¹⁴³ He also quotes here a commentary on the death of Henry IV, affirming that the assassination was the result of a conspiracy led by the Duc d'Epemon in the aftermath of the Catholic League, and not, as the official version would have it, 'le coup d'un insensé qui avoit

perdu l'esprit'.¹⁴⁴ This passage is taken directly from the 1729 edition of Lenglet's Méthode pour étudier l'histoire,¹⁴⁵ but, as he openly states in this 'Avertissement':

Je suis bien aise d'avertir les curieux, qu'ils ne trouveront pas actuellement cet endroit dans la Méthode pour étudier l'Histoire; c'est un des cartons qu'on a eu la bonté de faire à cet ouvrage; j'ignore quel en a été le motif. Serait-il défendu après un siècle et demi, de chercher à dévoiler la vérité de faits aussi importants que celui-ci.¹⁴⁶

Not surprisingly, then, Lenglet was ordered to remove certain items from his Supplément,¹⁴⁷ which would have involved an extensive, time-consuming and costly operation of excising the offending leaves from all the printed volumes, and inserting an alternative text to fill the gaps thus created: this is precisely what Lenglet had rashly undertaken to do in the letter quoted above. He had no intention, however, of actually complying with his promise, and he and Rollin went ahead unabashed and issued the volume in its original state. The ripost, from the administration came quickly: the distribution presumably commenced some time in March 1743, along with the last volumes of Secousse's set.¹⁴⁸ On the 28th March the Supplément was suppressed by order of the Conseil d'Etat,¹⁴⁹ and a lettre de cachet was issued from Versailles against the abbé Lenglet and the publisher Rollin.¹⁵⁰ The former was arrested and taken to the Bastille the following day to start his sixth term of imprisonment at the age of sixty-eight.¹⁵¹ The documents from the Bastille archives would suggest that Rollin was arrested at the same time,¹⁵² but Secousse recounted the affair as follows in a letter to Bouhier in June 1743:

Dans le même temps qu'on arrêta l'abbé Lenglet, un exempt alla pour se saisir de Rollin qui se sauva par une porte de derrière. L'abbé Lenglet ayant jase à la Bastille et déclaré que c'était Rollin qui avait fait les frais de l'impression, celui-ci n'a pu en disconvenir et en a envoyé près de 500 exemplaires à la chambre syndicale. Il est intervenu un arrêt du conseil qui ordonne que la boutique de Rollin sera murée, qui le condamne à une amende de mille livres, et les exemplaires saisis au pilon. Rien de tout cela n'a encore été exécuté.¹⁵³

This account raises an interesting question as to whether the copies sent to the chambre syndicale were actually destroyed, leaving possibly only 500 copies on the market: we have no positive evidence to establish this fact.

The punishment meted out to Lenglet was judged by contemporary writers to be excessively harsh in relation to the offence. Secousse, himself a royal censor, made the following remarks to Bouhier, calling into question the relevance and efficacy of the censorship system itself:

Je pense bien comme vous, Monsieur. Ces jugements sont bien rigoureux. La Recueil est bon, bien fait et utile. Il ne mourra point: on dit qu'on le contrefait dans plusieurs endroits et, dans un an, il y en aura à Paris plus de deux mille exemplaires.¹⁵⁴ J'ai fait toutes ces représentations à Mr. le chancelier; mais inutilement. Quoique naturellement bon, il a été inflexible. Je lui ai proposé, pour sauver en même temps et le livre et les règles, différents arrangements qui me paraissaient très convenables; mais il n'en a voulu agréer aucun.[.] L'arrêt contre Rollin n'empêche point ici les éditions furtives; et l'on a contrefait l'essai de Mr Boureau-Deslandes sur le commerce et la marine que l'on n'avait point voulu laisser passer: car rien ne passe plus.¹⁵⁵

It would appear from this response that Lenglet was to some extent the victim of one of those periodic bursts of severity on the part of the administration in face of the uncontrollable infringements of the publishing laws, and they wished to make an example of him. Voltaire responded sympathetically to his plight, writing in a letter of the 4th April:

Les lettres sont ici plus persécutées que favorisées. On vient de mettre à la Bastille l'abbé Lenglet pour avoir publié des Mémoires déjà connus qui servent de supplément à l'histoire de Mr de Thou; il a rendu un très grand service aux bons citoyens, et aux amateurs des recherches sur l'histoire, il méritoit des récompenses, et on l'emprisonne à l'âge de soixante et huit ans.

Insere nunc Meliboeae, pone ordine vites (Virgil, Eclogues, 1.73).¹⁵⁶

In August, unaware that Lenglet had already been released, he wrote from the Hague to the Chancellor d'Argenson himself, expressing similar sentiments:

Je gémis de voir ce pauvre abbé Lenglet enfermé, à soixante-dix ans, dans la Bastille, après nous avoir donné une bonne Méthode pour étudier l'histoire, et d'excellentes tables chronologiques. Qui sont donc les vandales qui se sont imaginé que l'impression du VIe volume des additions à l'histoire de ce bon citoyen le président de Thou était un crime d'état?¹⁵⁷

Voltaire was, however, less complimentary on the content of the work when it was removed from the political arena, and later criticised Lenglet's principles of historical criticism in accepting hearsay evidence on the subject of Ravallac's possible accomplices.¹⁵⁸

As Secousse suggests, Lenglet did evidently respond co-operatively to the police interrogations, giving evidence against Rollin, and thus hoping to procure his own release. Throughout the two months following his arrest he sent numerous placets to the Chancellor, to the governor of the Bastille, to the Lieutenant de police, begging for his release or at least 'quelque adoucissement',¹⁵⁹ and reminding them that:

Il a exposé exactement la vérité des faits dans les mémoires qu'il a fait remettre à Monseigneur; il ne sauroit parler autrement sans se déshonorer luy-même par une fausse accusation; ce qui n'est pas moins défendu que d'accuser faussement un autre.¹⁶⁰

The Governor seems to have offered him one opportunity of occupying his time usefully: a file in the Archives de la Bastille contains the 'Instructions des ministres pour la formation d'une bibliothèque de la Bastille', along with various catalogues of which one at least is in Lenglet's hand.¹⁶¹ This is a 'Mémoire des Livres de devotion et histoire a acheter pour la Bibliothèque de la Bastille', and includes 30 copies of the Imitation de Jesus-Christ, and 4 of the Oeuvres spirituelles de Fénelon, along with works on history by Rollin, Maimbourg, Varillas etc., all of which were favourites with the abbé. The estimated bill for these purchases amounted to 2314 livres. Such work can hardly have been an unpleasant occupation for Lenglet, and no doubt increased his credit with

the prison authorities: in view of his age he scarcely anticipated that he would in the future be in a position to benefit from his own recommendations. In his letters Lenglet appeals to the paternalism of the administrators he reminds them that his domestic and business interests are suffering from his detention. He has to pay rent on his apartment, which is pointless since he intends to return to live with his family (presumably his sister Marguerite) after his release; he has an action under way against the Hôtel de Ville for the recovery of insurance money due to him; he has books on loan from the royal library as well as from various individuals, and is worried about the delay in returning them; his publishers are looking for the preface to a work which is in the course of being printed.¹⁶² That the Chancellor took such arguments seriously is evidenced by the fact that on receipt of this last letter he decided that Lenglet should be released at Whitsun,¹⁶³ Moreover the Lieutenant de Police, de Marville, gave permission for the aggrieved publishers to visit Lenglet in prison in the company of M. Maboul, Directeur de la Librairie;¹⁶⁴ the abbé probably refused to give them the preface until he was released, precisely in order to use their predicament as a bargaining counter.

Lenglet was duly released on the 8th June;¹⁶⁵ he did not, as he had suggested in his letter to the Chancellor, abandon his apartment to live with his more opulent sister, but continued in very much the same way of life as before. In an initial fit of pique he refused to continue with the preparation of his edition of the Journal de Henri III,¹⁶⁶ which he tells us he had undertaken 'par ordre de feu M. de Chancelier Daguesseau'.¹⁶⁷ This project of re-editing the Journal by Pierre de l'Estoile¹⁶⁸ had first been adopted by Thomas Bouges, Augustinian,¹⁶⁹

who had already edited the Journal du règne de Henri IV:¹⁷⁰ this had been published in Paris by the veuve Gandouin (ostensibly at 'La Haye, chez Vaillant') in 1741, but Bouges died in December of that year, before his new plans had come to fruition - 'heureusement pour cette édition' Secousse cruelly remarked - and the publishers then turned to Lenglet to continue to work.¹⁷¹ Secousse, who had been interested in the project from the beginning, was appointed censor, commenting in October 1742:

Elle sera très bien exécutée: j'en ai vu les premières feuilles. Cela fera un très bon Recueil, car il sera considérablement augmenté... [L'abbé Lenglet-Dufresnoy] est un homme qui a bien des connaissances et qui connaît parfaitement notre histoire moderne; mais il a besoin d'un frein et c'est moi qui ai été choisi pour l'avoir en main. Je lui tiendrai la bride haute et j'empêcherai qu'il ne morde ou blesse personne.¹⁷²

But the work was interrupted at a fairly advanced stage by Lenglet's term of imprisonment, and the abbé, as if to avenge himself on the intelligentsia of the administration and its agents, whom he perceived to be anxious about the completion of the work, refused to continue his labours on his release. Secousse relates the events with a shrewd and rather cynical superiority:

De dépit, l'abbé Lenglet ne veut point continuer à travailler à la nouvelle édition du Journal d'Henry III, quoique le deuxième volume soit presque achevé et qu'il y ait une permission tacite bien enregistrée; mais j'espère que bientôt la maladie appelée faute d'argent, et à laquelle le bon abbé est au moins aussi sujet que l'était Panurge, le forcera de continuer.¹⁷³

He was not far wrong in his predictions, and six months later he could write triumphantly:

J'avais bien prévu qu'il ne tiendrait pas sa colère à l'égard du Journal d'Henry III. Il en continuera l'édition qui est très bien exécutée et qui paraîtra à Pâques.¹⁷⁴

In his edition Lenglet corrected the text as published by Denis Godefroy in 1720, principally from a manuscript in the Dupuy collection

communicated to him by Joly de Fleury, former Procureur général au Parlement;¹⁷⁵ he added his own historical notes to those of Godefroy, and augmented the edition with a number of contemporary pieces 'pour appuyer, éclaircir et fortifier le Texte de M. de l'Estoille, qui est écrit d'une maniere libre, mais véridique'.¹⁷⁶ Lenglet projected an edition in 5 volumes, and Secousse comments that he could have filled ten with interesting and rare items 'si on avait été sûr de trouver des acheteurs'.¹⁷⁷ The latter himself contributed one piece, another proof of his keen interest in the publication,¹⁷⁸ and Lenglet's preface and notes indicate the degree of help and encouragement he received from other respected scholars and noblemen: in addition to M. Joly de Fleury, he thanks the Abbés Bignon and Sallier, royal librarians, for the access they afforded him to essential manuscript material in the Bibliothèque du Roi,¹⁷⁹ and the Benedictines of Saint Germain des Près for the extensive use they allowed him of their manuscripts, 'l'un des plus précieux dépôts que nous ayons, pour l'Histoire de France, sur-tout pour celle des trois derniers Siècles'.¹⁸⁰ Nonetheless, despite the degree of relative respectability to which this collaboration testifies, Secousse still exercised his role of censor to force a significant number of corrections to Lenglet's notes in the first two volumes, necessitating the printing of a large number of cartons to substitute for the original pages.¹⁸¹ As usual, not all copies of the work were corrected, so happily we can compare the original and the censored states of the text. Most of the excised remarks gave vent to Lenglet's lively satiric tongue, castigating in turn the Parlements, the regular clergy (favourite butts of his wit), or the monarchs, as when he states that Henri III had no time to deal with serious problems, for

'il avoit ses Mignons à entretenir; et à imaginer de quelle maniere il s'habilleroit le lendemain, et quelle nouvelle mode il inventeroit'.¹⁸²

He also, in a number of places, condemns the massacres of Saint Bartholomew's Day, as he had done in the Supplément aux Mémoires de Condé, at one point quoting the sentiments expressed by Pierre Matthieu to the effect that 'Cette journée de sang et de misere, devoit être effacée des Fastes de la France, pour le tort qu'elle fait à la mémoire de nos Rois, et à l'honneur de la France', which, Lenglet openly states, echoes the feelings he had himself expressed in a previous work, and which had been deleted by the censor.¹⁸³ but, he adds, 'je pense et je penserai toujours de même'.¹⁸⁴ Lenglet can scarcely have expected that such a blatant flouting of one censor's authority would be passed ~~by~~ another.

The subject of the injustices perpetrated against the Protestants was in fact one to which Lenglet returned on many occasions, and on which he had strong feelings: in his notes to these editions of documents of the period he makes very clear his abhorrence of the 'Ligueurs' and what they stood for, and his sympathy with the Protestant demands for tolerance. Nowhere are his sentiments more eloquently expressed than in a note extended to 6 pages on the 'affaire horrible de la Sainte-Barthelémy',¹⁸⁵ in which he recounts the sequence of events, and particularly the murder of the Amiral de Coligny, in what is for him an unusually succinct, but vivid and moving style. It is devoid of his habitual exclamations and extrapolations, but he succeeds in making his own viewpoint perfectly clear, as when he remarks:

On fit encore frapper des Médailles, pour conserver la mémoire de toutes ces horreurs, comme si l'Histoire devoit être muette à ce sujet.¹⁸⁶

He intends his historical account to provoke disgust and condemnation of a massacre whose prime motors, he suggests, were a combination of religious fanaticism and personal greed for power and wealth. This lengthy note was in fact republished in 1830 in a Collection des meilleurs dissertations, notices et traités particuliers relatifs à l'histoire de France.¹⁸⁷ Lenglet's edition of the Journal contained many other weighty and interesting notes. Among the 'pièces manuscrites les plus curieuses de ce Regne' which he announced on his title-page, there were two so rare and in such high demand among book-collectors that the publisher had a few extra copies of each printed and sold separately: these were La Guisiade, tragédie nouvelle, by Pierre Mathieu,¹⁸⁸ and La Tragédie de feu Gaspard de Colligny, by François de Chantelouve,¹⁸⁹ both accompanied by Lenglet's notes.¹⁹⁰ The edition which finally appeared c. September 1744 was in 5 volumes, but Secousse intimated to Bouhier that these would be followed by a supplement in two or three volumes, which project was never in fact realised.¹⁹¹ This would suggest that the response from the public was not as favourable as the parties concerned had hoped for, but I have found no material in the press to substantiate or refute this supposition. Yet the edition always held a high value on the market, largely, according to the Catalogue des livres composant la bibliothèque de feu M. le Baron J. de Rothschild, 'grâce aux pièces qui la complètent et aux notes piquantes qui y sont jointes';¹⁹² but also because, as Michault underlined, 'cette Edition peut être regardée comme un chef-d'oeuvre de Typographie' along with the Journal du règne de Henri IV¹⁹³ which, as we have seen, was produced by the same publisher.

A third similar project was the publication of the popular Mémoires de

Messire Philippe de Comines,¹⁹⁴ chamberlain of Louis XI;¹⁹⁵ these had been published as recently as 1723, edited with notes by the respected scholar Jean Godefroy whom Lenglet had known in Lille,¹⁹⁶ but the abbé obviously judged that there would be a market for a new luxury quarto edition. He had clearly smoothed over any grievance Rollin might have had against him for 'spilling the beans' about the Supplément aux Mémoires de Condé, for it was the latter who openly offered the work for subscription late in 1745.¹⁹⁷ Once again there was a close co-operation with Secousse, not necessarily by Lenglet's choice, but because he had been appointed censor; when the work finally appeared it carried the transparent colophon 'A Londres, et se trouve à Paris, chez Rollin fils', which clearly indicates that a permission tacite had again been negotiated with the authorities. In December 1745 Secousse forecasted that it would be in the shops in the following year, assuring Bouhier that 'Elle est très bien exécutée et ce sera un bon ouvrage', adding that, with regard to the notes:

Je l'ai réduit [l'abbé Lenglet] par mes représentations, et en me servant quelquefois de mon autorité de censeur, à n'y mettre rien qui ne serve à l'éclaircissement de l'histoire et à l'intelligence du texte.¹⁹⁸

Secousse had himself communicated an early edition of the Mémoires to Lenglet, but the principal authority on which he had based his text was an early manuscript in the library of Saint Germain des Prés, and two later manuscripts in the royal library. But unfortunately, as we have remarked à-propos of earlier editions, though Lenglet went to considerable pains to locate this material he is extremely vague on the subject of the critical processes employed in editing the text, remarking:

Si j'avais suivi la Méthode de quelque littérateurs, qui font parade d'un grand nombre de corrections hasardées, et de Variantes, souvent inutiles, on serait étonné de la multitude de celles que fournissent ces Manuscrits. Il n'y en a pas moins de trois mille; parmi lesquelles

il s'en trouve de si importantes, que j'ai cru en devoir avertir dans quelques-unes de mes notes; parce qu'elles rétablissent le sens de cet Auteur, qui était extrêmement corrompu en quelques endroits. ¹⁹⁹

His choice of texts and variants are by implication therefore based on a fairly arbitrary selection process, shirking the careful scholarship which a thorough collation and consistent system of annotation would have demanded.

As was the case for the related editions, Lenglet again received considerable co-operation from other scholars and Academicians: in addition to Secousse, the Benedictines of Saint-Germain des Prés, ²⁰⁰ and the abbés Bignon and Sallier at the Bibliothèque du Roi where he borrowed the Comines manuscripts as early as 1742, ²⁰¹ he owed a special debt of gratitude to Charles Duclos, member of the Académie des Inscriptions and later of the Académie Française. ²⁰² Duclos was in the course of preparing his Histoire de Louis XI, which he published in four volumes in 1745; a more respectable and orthodox scholar than our abbé, Duclos had been given on loan from the royal library a huge collection of manuscripts concerning Louis XI which had been put together by the abbé le Grand in the early part of the century. ²⁰³

Lenglet in his Preface states:

M. Duclos [...] me fit l'amitié de m'avertir, qu'il avait actuellement entre les mains les Collections de feu M. l'Abbé le Grand [...]. Il me témoigna que pour l'avantage de la littérature, il me les communiquerait avec joie, sous le bon plaisir de Monseigneur le Comte de Maurepas, ²⁰⁴ et des Illustres et habiles personnes qui sont chargées du dépôt de la Bibliothèque de Sa Majesté. Je n'eus garde de refuser des offres si utiles et faites d'une manière si obligeante, qui tendaient à perfectionner cette nouvelle Edition de Philippe de Comines. J'avoue que sans ce secours elle n'aurait pas été aussi parfaite ni aussi remplie que je la donne. ²⁰⁵

It is rather unlikely that Duclos should have spontaneously approached a personage such as Lenglet; it is more probable that the offer was

made through the intermediary of an academic colleague of Duclos', the obvious possibility being Secousse, and the approval of Maurepas was no doubt obtained through the same channels. Lenglet published approximately 350 items from the collection, which make up a significant part of his edition.²⁰⁶ Duclos evidently did not fear Lenglet's competition; there may have been an understanding between them as to their respective claims in the area, which is hinted at by Lenglet in his Preface:

J'ai pris garde à deux choses, d'abord à ne point trop appuyer sur les faits que M. Duclos a détaillés pour ne pas faire des répétitions inutiles: je me suis contenté d'examiner en particulier ceux qu'il n'a fait qu'effleurer, ou sur lesquels il a crû devoir passer. J'ai eu soin d'ailleurs de ne point imprimer les pièces qu'il a données dans son dernier Volume. A peine s'en trouve-t-il trois ou quatre, mais fort courtes, que je n'ai pû me dispenser de publier de nouveau. Et je me flatte qu'il ne me désapprouvera pas.²⁰⁷

The phrase 'il a crû devoir passer' would suggest that Duclos' motivation in helping Lenglet may not have been very different from that of Secousse in relation to the Condé edition: that is, a desire to see in print certain contentious materials, for example documents casting unfavourable light on some of the great families of France, without being himself responsible for their publication. Secousse, however, apparently kept a reasonably strict check on Lenglet, and this time none of his notes had to be altered after printing. The only problem arose in relation to a rather strange Dedication to the Maréchal Comte Maurice de Saxe: illegitimate son of Augustus II, Elector of Saxony and King of Poland, Maurice had first taken up arms against the French, and had fought with Prince Eugene of Savoy in Hungary. In 1720 the Regent invited him to join the French army, where he gained distinction as one of the finest generals in Europe.²⁰⁸ Lenglet had written of him in highly approbatory terms in his anonymous Lettres d'un pair de la Grande-Bretagne,²⁰⁹ the Maréchal, at the head of the French troops, having just won a decisive victory over the Anglo-Dutch forces at the battle of Fontenoy

(11th May, 1745). Whether Lenglet simply wished to express his admiration for de Saxe, or whether there were channels through which he could have hoped for a financial reward, we do not know: the former possibility cannot be ruled out in view of his disinterested Dedication to the Count Hoym which we have already noted.²¹⁰ The terms which Lenglet employed in this instance were, however, unacceptable to the royal administration: the dedication was, after all, addressed to a foreigner, though one on whom the king had recently conferred letters of naturalisation, and some of his remarks expressed a rather ambiguous adulation, declaring Maurice to be 'Digne de porter une Couronne, puisqu'il sçait la défendre'. This must have been interpreted as a provocation to the royal authority, for the whole Dedication was suppressed, along with an engraved portrait of the Maréchal, presumably on the recommendation of Secousse.²¹¹ A number of copies of these items escaped, however, of which there were two different states,²¹² which would suggest that the publisher printed additional copies and was willing to include them for a price, as had been the case with the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire in 1729.²¹³ Certainly, if they did not have it at the outset, copies with these two pages quickly acquired a higher value than those without.²¹⁴

An additional attractive feature in the presentation of the work was an optional set of engraved portraits produced by Michel Odieuvre, 'Marchand d'estampes, rue d'Anjou Dauphine'; there were 55 in the series, representing famous personages under the reigns of Louis XI and Charles VIII.²¹⁵ The Mémoires de Trévoux devoted a special 'notice' to the portraits, describing them in highly approbatory tones:

Ce ne sont pas des portraits d'imagination comme la plupart de ceux qu'on insere ordinairement dans l'Histoire. Tous sont tirés sur des Originaux, soit tombeaux, soit miniatures du tems, soit même des tableaux peints dans le siècle où ils ont vécu[...]. Cette suite sera incontestablement l'une des plus belles de celles qu'a fait graver le sieur Odieuvre, qui continue toujours avec le même succès à nous donner les portraits des personnes illustres, tant du Royaume que des Pays étrangers. ²¹⁶

In addition to the basic series and the portrait of Maurice de Saxe, there was a portrait of Lenglet himself, which seems to have been included in a small number of copies, ²¹⁷ a frontispiece, and two fold-out tables. The engraving of Lenglet is probably the only portrait extant: it was used again in Dreux du Radier's Europe illustrée published by Odieuvre in 1765. ²¹⁸ Not surprisingly the Journal des savants also announced the edition as 'très-belle, et très-bien exécutée', and added that it was 'encore la plus complete qui ait paru jusqu'à présent', ²¹⁹ for which it was esteemed by the scholarly circle which had supported its publication. It was much sought after by bibliophiles, and no doubt by the wealthy bourgeoisie who aspired to fill their libraries with beautiful and imposing books. One copy from the library of the Duc de la Vallière, with the portraits and the Dedication, was sold for 286 francs before the end of the century. ²²⁰

There were other related projects in which Lenglet was involved, but which never came to fruition. One was an edition of the works of the Président Pierre Jeannin, royal ambassador and minister under François II, Henri IV and Louis XIII, which had been published in Paris in 1656; ²²¹ we have seen above that Secousse, as censor of the proposed edition, had given advice to the publishers regarding the form it should take, and had delegated Lenglet to search the large Parisian libraries for unpublished Jeannin manuscripts. ²²² It is likely that the

abbé would have taken on an editorial role as he had for the Condé Supplément and the Journal du règne de Henri III, but for reasons we do not know, the project was dropped: no new edition appeared before 1819. We have also seen, in Lenglet's letter to the Chancellor on the subject of the Supplément, that he had been planning a re-edition of a work by Pierre-Victor Cayet, the Chronologie novenaire, contenant l'histoire de la guerre, sous le règne du très-chrétien Roy de France et de Navarre, Henry IV, first published in 1608.²²³ Secousse mentioned the project to Bouhier in July 1740,²²⁴ and Lenglet even listed the proposed edition in the bibliography of his Supplément de la Méthode pour étudier l'histoire (1740) as being published in London in eight volumes in 1741,²²⁵ adding:

Cette nouvelle Edition est accompagnée de Notes historiques, et d'un grand nombre de Pieces justificatives, nécessaires pour la connoissance du Regne de Henri IV. l'un des plus importants de notre Histoire. Cet Ouvrage doit paroître dans peu.

It would thus have followed closely the pattern of the editions we have been considering. Yet this edition was never published, and J.-B. Michault reports that at Lenglet's death not a single item relating to this subject was found among his papers:²²⁶ presumably he dropped the project at an early stage of its execution.

Another work relating to the same period, and often associated with the Chronologie novenaire, was the Mémoires de la ligue sous Henri III et Henri IV, by Simon Goulart, published in Geneva in 1587; the success of the Mémoires de Condé, Michault tells us, led two Parisian booksellers to reprint Goulart's work in similar form. Michault does not suggest that Lenglet was involved in this undertaking: the work appeared only in 1758, three years after his death,²²⁷ and was edited by the abbé

Claude-Pierre Goujet. Yet according to Quérard the edition was in fact 'préparée par Lenglet du Fresnoy et publiée après sa mort par l'abbé Goujet'.²²⁸ We have no positive proof to this effect, but it is not unlikely that Lenglet should have been involved in the project in some capacity at an early stage because of the reputation he had by then acquired in the area, and he may well have left some preliminary research among the mass of material found in his apartment after his death.²²⁹ Finally, Michault informs us, Lenglet had planned to collect in one or two volumes 'quelques-unes de ces petites Pièces du siècle dernier qui passent pour des chefs-d'oeuvres', such as the Histoire du Siège de Dunkerque published in 1646; Michault had actually seen Lenglet's manuscript corrections and notes on the latter work which was ready for printing.²³⁰ It was no doubt the conflicting demands of his many publishing ventures which led Lenglet to neglect or abandon such half-matured projects.

Consolidation of established interests

In these highly prolific years of the 1740 s Lenglet revised many of his earlier works, and from some of them developed new projects in similar areas. Thus the Tables chronologiques which had been published in four large folio sheets to accompany the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire in 1729 was the germ from which developed a work in two octavo volumes, the Tablettes chronologiques de l'histoire universelle, published by de Bure and Ganeau at the end of 1743.²³¹ With the development of historiography during the preceding decades - the displacement of

the Bible from the centre of universal history, and new research into the history of individual regions and civilisations - there was, as A.M. Rousseau has pointed out, a great upsurge of interest in chronology:

Parmi les problèmes à résoudre, la chronologie, en dépit des incertitudes des spécialistes, et peut-être à cause d'elles, connut au XVIIIème siècle une vogue extraordinaire, formant d'ailleurs le fond de l'enseignement historique,²³²

and this despite Voltaire's attacks on it as an inaccurate and sterile science.²³³ The Tablettes were among the most popular of all Lenglet's publications: they were frequently re-edited up to 1830, and translated into three foreign languages,²³⁴ for the French were in the forefront of the field in Europe.²³⁵

The work opens with a lengthy 'Discours préliminaire sur la manière abrégée d'étudier l'histoire', which was later described by one critic as an 'extrait' from the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire,²³⁶ one of the objects of this essay is to indicate how one can cover certain areas of the subject in the minimum period of time, which leads Lenglet into elaborate calculations of the number of hours it might take the average reader to complete a set number of works. Thus, for example, he concludes one could learn all about the history of the church for the past 100 years in 5 months. Such calculations on the art of 'cramming' not unexpectedly earned Lenglet some scathing commentaries from the critics:

Qui pourroit résister à la force de cet argument? L'Auteur n'entend ici qu'une simple lecture, sans discussion, et apparemment aussi sans réflexion, comme sans la moindre distraction. Mais qui lit ainsi? Un sot.²³⁷

There follows a list of the 'livres nécessaires pour l'étude de l'histoire', the rest of the first volume being devoted to the 'tables

et tablettes' on ancient history.²³⁸ Volume II contained the tables on modern history, along with a number of supplements to volume I. The material was less controversial than the historical editions, and was approved by the abbé Sallier. He did nevertheless order the suppression of one of Lenglet's habitual attacks on two Jesuit writers when he advised his readers: 'sur-tout ne lisez pas l'Histoire Romaine des Peres Catrou et Rouillé'.²³⁹

The reactions on the appearance of the work were in the main critical on points of detail; such was Lenglet's reputation for inaccuracy that some scholars rejected his new work on these grounds even without reading it. Thus Secousse wrote:

L'infatigable mais peu exact abbé Lenglet vient de publier des tables chronologiques en deux volumes in-8° de très petits caractères. Je ne les ai point parcourues, mais je gagerais bien qu'on ferait un bon gros volume des fautes qui s'y trouvent,²⁴⁰

sentiments echoed by his correspondent Bouhier.²⁴¹ Others took pains to study them carefully, with the obvious intent of finding the inaccuracies. One such was the abbé Joseph Valart,²⁴² on whom Lenglet made a blistering attack in the 'Discours préliminaire' of the Tablettes, in retaliation for adverse comments which Valart had made on Lenglet's works on geography with the sole intention, the latter assures us, '[de] procurer par-là quelque mérite au médiocre squelette de Géographie qu'il vient de publier'.²⁴³ Valart, determined to turn the accusation of ignorance and incompetence back against Lenglet, published a 24-page brochure entitled Lettre critique à M. l'abbé Lenglet du Fresnoy, auteur des Tablettes chronologiques.²⁴⁴ Examining two pages out of Lenglet's Tome I, he picks out 80 'faults' which he suggests the good abbé should correct. Many are small errors of detail such as

misspellings of proper names or incorrect dates; others are defects in style. The tone is, of course, highly ironic, the author taking up Lenglet's invitation (in his 'Discours préliminaire') to other scholars to correct his work,²⁴⁵ and giving a clue to his identity by referring specifically to the attack on 'Jaque Veillard'. The pamphlet was given good coverage in the press: the ubiquitous abbé Desfontaines in his Jugements sur quelques ouvrages nouveaux was evidently delighted with the opportunity to belittle Lenglet, suggesting that the errors must have been due to his being overcome by sleep, worn out by his 'nombreux et rapides travaux'.²⁴⁶ He adds that brochures such as this one save the good name of French scholars in the eyes of their foreign counterparts:

De petits Ouvrages, où nous relevons nous-mêmes les bévues et les âneries de nos Compatriotes, leur font connoître que nous avons de vrais Sçavans, et que nos doctes personnages ne sont pas ceux qui font le plus de Livres, et qui se livrent à la Compilation;²⁴⁷

the pointe intended for our abbé is obvious.²⁴⁸ The Mémoires de Trévoux likewise commented favourably on the brochure.²⁴⁹

But, despite such criticisms, the commentaries of a more general nature which appeared over the following decades bear testimony to the favourable public response which Lenglet's work enjoyed. Lenglet's biographer Michault, a disciple of the Président Bouhier, wrote in 1761:

Un Journaliste a remarqué que ces Tablettes n'avoient fait aucun mouvement: mais le Livre n'en est pas moins bon; c'est même un des meilleurs de l'Abbé Lenglet, qui a suivi pas à pas dans cette carrière les plus célèbres chronologues et les plus fidèles Historiens.²⁵⁰

Mayeul-Chaudon, in his Bibliothèque d'un homme de goût in 1772, remarked on how many bad works had been published on chronology, and continued:

Nous avons eu ensuite les Tablettes de l'Abbé du Fresnoy, qui, quoiqu'elles laissent désirer quelque chose quant à la méthode, sont d'un grand secours pour tous les gens de Lettres.²⁵¹

Even Voltaire, who attacked Lenglet for repeating mere 'fables',²⁵² nonetheless ordered the Tablettes for his own use:²⁵³ he had, moreover, qualified the earlier folio work as 'd'excellentes tables chronologiques'.²⁵⁴ It is not surprising, then, that Lenglet projected a second 'revised' edition, for which a body of material was found among his papers after his death; de Bure had the work completed by other scholars and published it in 1763,²⁵⁵ by which time many pirate editions and translations had already been published abroad.

Lenglet dedicated his Tablettes to Cardinal Domenico Passionei;²⁵⁶ we recall how the two men had met almost 35 years earlier, during the 'Tournai' affair, when the young Count Passionei was a secret envoy of the Pope at the Hague.²⁵⁷ They had renewed their acquaintance at the peace conference held at Utrecht in 1712-1713, where a friendship developed between Passionei and Prince Eugene, Lenglet's erstwhile patron; the abbé asserts in his Dedication that he had himself assisted at meetings between these two 'Héros', where they indulged their common love of books and things literary.²⁵⁸ Lenglet here flatters the Cardinal's self-image as a Maecenas on an international scale:

Il n'est pas possible d'aimer les Lettres; on ne sçauroit cultiver les vrais Sçavans, sans être informé de l'amour que vous portez aux uns et aux autres.

Passionei did in fact have a huge network of correspondents throughout Europe; it included famous writers like Winckelmann and Voltaire, and scholars in all walks of life who offered him the adulation and flattery he thrived on, in return for which he helped them in their research with information drawn from his rich personal library, and from the Vatican library of which he was to become chief conservator in 1755. He always, however, made the beneficiary aware of the full weight of his services.²⁵⁹

Among his most regular correspondents in France were Lacurne de Sainte-Palaye, medieval scholar and member of the Académie des Inscriptions, who met the Cardinal on a visit to Rome in 1739,²⁶⁰ and Lenglet, a proportion of whose letters have survived.²⁶¹ It is difficult to establish when the correspondence began on a regular basis. There are, among the extant collections, a couple of letters dating from 1714, in which Lenglet begged the Cardinal's intercession for the award of a benefice in Lille;²⁶² the next dated letter which I have found was written on 5th July 1745. It is therefore a matter of conjecture as to whether the correspondence was kept up after 1714, or whether it was revitalised, as seems more likely, after Passionei's recall to Rome in 1738: he was then free to develop his interest in his library, and Lenglet, an internationally known bibliographer, was an ideal person to help him in building it up. Thus Lenglet became a sort of literary agent for the Cardinal, as he had been earlier for the Minister Le Blanc and for Prince Eugene, buying books for him from the libraires and at the book sales, and sending them to Rome, often with the help of Sainte-Palaye through whom messages to the abbé could likewise be channelled.²⁶³ He also sent Passionei copies of all his own works,²⁶⁴ including censored material which should theoretically have been removed: thus, for example, the Cardinal received one of the few un-mutilated copies of the Histoire de la monarchie française.²⁶⁵ Likewise when Passionei, in the late 1740's, wished to publish a third edition of his Acta legationis Helveticae, which had first appeared in 1729 during his nunciature in Switzerland, it was Lenglet who undertook to supervise the edition and struck a bargain with de Bure.²⁶⁶

Lenglet also provided a service of a different kind for the Cardinal:

his letters, especially those of 1754-1755, are increasingly close to the Journal mode, full of the literary and political news of Paris. He kept Passionei up-to-date on affairs such as that of the refus des Sacrements, the Cardinal being notoriously sympathetic to the Jansenists, and the quarrels between the Parlement de Paris and the royal administration.²⁶⁷ Because of their strong 'political' content these letters were often anonymous, or signed with pen-names such as 'Vitriol' or 'de Saint-Olon'.²⁶⁸ He also sent recipes for health-cures to Rome, or for making invisible ink which he himself used in certain of the letters.

But the obligations were not all unilateral: Lenglet repeatedly beseeched the Cardinal to procure him a church benefice, by putting pressure on the French episcopate who would have the power to grant him one.²⁶⁹ He reminds him of the services he rendered the church in 1710 and of which Passionei was himself a witness. The latter did write on one occasion to the Papal Nuncio in Paris asking him to recommend Lenglet to the appropriate authorities, but as on previous occasions no benefice was forthcoming.²⁷⁰ With other requests Lenglet had more success: he repeatedly asked for Passionei's help in procuring copies of manuscript material in the Vatican library, and in his own private collection.²⁷¹ He made use of the Cardinal's close friendship with the Pope to acquire the latter's approval for his Traité des apparitions when he was having trouble with the French authorities over its publication.²⁷² Lenglet likewise asked Passionei to present copies of his works to the Pope, including a copy of the Tablettes chronologiques,²⁷³ and to request permission to dedicate to the latter a new Latin edition of the Imitation de Jesus-Christ.²⁷⁴ Thus the connection proved most

useful to the abbé; we must assume that the Cardinal, difficult and patronising as he seems to have been in performing even relatively minor services for his scholarly acquaintances, put a high value on the correspondence with Lenglet since he responded positively to at least some of his requests.

An edition of which Lenglet wrote often to the Cardinal, and which demanded of him years of exhausting toil, was the complete works of Lactantius, a late 3rd/early 4th century Christian orator and apologist.²⁷⁵ Lenglet tells us in his Preface that he had, in his youth, been greatly interested in the works of Lactantius, but had abandoned any thoughts of editing them when he found that Jean-Baptiste Lebrun Desmarettes was working on just such a project.²⁷⁶ He passed on to Lebrun some of the rare editions which he had himself collected, along with his notes on the subject;²⁷⁷ but Lebrun never completed the edition, and on his death in 1731 his notes and papers were in turn passed back to Lenglet who undertook to complete the long-awaited work. Lebrun, a careful and laborious scholar, had collated a large number of manuscripts and early editions, and had added textual and philological notes; Lenglet felt that it would be necessary to consult other sources, and add his own notes of a more literary, historical and critical nature. He found his material not only in the great libraries of Paris, such as that of the Cardinal de Rohan, with whom, as we have seen, he had studied in his younger days, and to whom his edition is dedicated: his correspondence with Passionei again bears witness to his efforts to enrich his edition by procuring information on manuscript material in Rome.²⁷⁸ The work dragged on over a number of years: Lenglet seems to have left the project aside in the 1730 s, and it is only in the

mid-1740 s that he begins to speak seriously of it: in September 1746 he apparently concluded a bargain with de Bure for its publication.²⁷⁹

The work, however, along with all the other projects which he had on hands, proved over-taxing, and in late 1747 he fell seriously ill. He wrote to Cardinal Passionei in April 1748:

L'excès du travail m'avoit causé il y a 6 mois un epuiselement qui m'a mis dans l'antichambre de la mort; mais je suis sorti de cet appartement et suis revenu dans celui de la vie par les bons soins que l'on a pris de moy.²⁸⁰

He was evidently heartily glad to see the completion of the project late in the year 1748,²⁸¹ and indicated his unwillingness to undertake any more of that kind of editorial labour:

Cet ouvrage où il y a eu pour moy moins d'esprit que de fatigue m'a degouté de ces Sortes de travaux. Il est temps meme que je me batte en retraite, sans néanmoins quitter les armes.²⁸²

He must nonetheless have been pleased with the end result: the two quarto volumes were beautifully printed,²⁸³ and well received by the critics: all commentators for once agreed that this was the best of all existing editions of Lactantius.²⁸⁴ Moreover, de Bure obviously expected a high sale, for he printed an edition of 1,500 copies, rather than 1,000 copies which was the most common practice,²⁸⁵ It is somewhat surprising that he should have counted on such a large readership for a theological work in Latin: he was presumably aiming largely at the monastery/seminary populations, and was probably willing to hold his stock over a significant length of time. His sales must have been to some extent adversely affected by the publication in Rome in 1754-1759 of a highly acclaimed edition in 14 octavo volumes, which was to supplant Lenglet's edition with the scholarly public: in 1777 only 44% of De Bure's copies had been sold.²⁸⁶

Another work of which Lenglet wrote frequently to Passionei at this time was the Imitation de Jésus-Christ, which he was planning to publish yet again, this time in a Latin edition in luxury quarto format.²⁸⁷ He first mentions it in July 1745, when he tells the Cardinal that he has written to the Pope asking permission to dedicate such an edition to him; he writes in some detail of the project, stating his text will be 'revûë sur beaucoup de manuscrits', with a new chapter not previously published. He even has the typographical details worked out: he sends some sample pages which include the 'cadres gravés en cuivre' which he intends to use.²⁸⁸ The work was interrupted by the preparation of the Lactantius, but in October 1748 Lenglet sent Passionei a copy of the proposed Dedication.²⁸⁹ Yet it was only in July 1749 that he asked the Cardinal to give him details of any manuscripts of the Imitation in the Vatican library,²⁹⁰ and in April 1750 Lenglet sends on what would appear to be a manuscript copy of his edition, with the additional chapter which he himself translated from French to Latin, having failed to locate it even in the Latin manuscripts in Germany.²⁹¹ But the work must have come to a complete halt at this time - partly no doubt as a result of his two terms of imprisonment - for in August 1754 we find that the abbé is still only at the research stage, and seems to have some doubts about his ability to complete the work:

Quoique selon les occurences de mon temps je travaille à revoir ce pieux et important ouvrage sur les manuscrits, je souhaite que d'autres y travaillent également.²⁹²

Nonetheless he was obviously annoyed when he heard that his old opponent, the abbé Valart, was also preparing an edition, and responded with his usual arrogance: 'Je ne crois pas que M. Vallart puisse aller plus loing que moi'.²⁹³ It would seem, however, that the final editorial effort was too much for Lenglet, now aged 80, and the work was not completed before his death in January 1755.²⁹⁴

The 1740 s saw Lenglet's last incursions into the purely literary area, with two new editions, both anonymous: the first was the poems of Catullus, Tibullus and Propertius,²⁹⁵ published in 1743 by Antoine-Urbain Coustelier II, who had succeeded his father of the same name with whom Lenglet had been on bad terms.²⁹⁶ The edition was generally acknowledged to have been 'revûe très-exactement':²⁹⁷ the Catullus texts alone had undergone 278 corrections, based largely on 'les manuscrits de Rome', of which Lenglet was apparently the first of the French editors to take account.²⁹⁸ The main feature of the edition was again its degree of typographical perfection, which was such, contemporaries asserted, that '[elle] peut être comparée aux éditions des Elzevirs';²⁹⁹ it could likewise be ranked with the Coustelier collection of French poets published in the 1720 s and with which Lenglet was to have been involved.³⁰⁰ A small number of copies, such as that owned by Gros de Boze, were printed on vellum and bound in three separate volumes.³⁰¹ The work was republished in identical form by J. Barbou in 1754.

From 1746-1747 appeared a Recueil de romans historique,⁵ made up largely of seventeenth-century fiction, ostensibly published in London, but probably published in Paris with a permission tacite.³⁰² Lenglet's name was not commonly linked with the work, but subsequent bibliographers have unanimously attributed it to him.³⁰³ The sentiments expressed in the Preface echo closely those of De l'Usage des romans on the treatment of love in novels:

On sçait que l'amour étant également un bien et un mal nécessaire, on est obligé d'en donner des leçons de pratique. Il est utile de faire voir les avantages qu'il produit comme vertu, quand il est sagement conduit: et l'on doit faire appercevoir aussi les tristes et fâcheux inconvéniens où il jette, quand on s'y comporte d'une maniere peu convenable,³⁰⁴

as on the relationship between novels and history:

On se souviendra toujours que ce sont des Romans, et non pas des Histoires que je publie; et que s'il est deshonorant aux Historiens d'aller contre la vérité, il est permis aux Romanciers de négliger souvent le vrai pour donner dans le vraisemblable; c'est même par-là qu'on a coutume de distinguer le Roman de l'Histoire. ³⁰⁵

In this instance however Lenglet took his editorial duties with much less seriousness than in his editions of historical texts: nothing, he says, should startle the imagination in 'livres d'amusement', and so he and a collaborator have corrected the style of a number of the pieces, 'modernising' the language and eliminating 'quelques manières de parler provinciales qu'on y avait semées', thus presenting the works 'un peu mieux décorés qu'ils n'étoient dans leur origine'. ³⁰⁶ Lenglet even went further than this kind of stylistic correction: he actually changed the ending of Raimond, Comte de Barcelone, from a tragic to a happy one, giving as his justification that love must not be debased in novels, ³⁰⁷ which again recalls the 'moral' arguments he used in De l'Usage des romans. ³⁰⁸ One suspects that Lenglet has his tongue very tightly in his cheek, and is guided by the hope of having his work distributed in France with the tacit agreement of the censors. There were certainly no aesthetic considerations to justify his action. His cavalier attitude on this occasion would lead one to wonder to what extent the careful scholarship of the 'historical' editions might have been a result of the control of Secousse and other 'respectable' scholars charged by the administration with overseeing Lenglet's productions. We have little indication of the extent of public interest in these re-editions. The editor, in the 'Avertissement' to the first volume, remarked:

Je dois avertir que si le commencement de ce Recueil est goûté, je le continuerai avec toute l'attention que mérite le Public; ³⁰⁹

perhaps the fact that he went on to publish a further seven volumes

can be taken as some indication that the sales were good, for otherwise the libraire would hardly have been interested in bringing out the later volumes.

One interesting feature of all Lenglet's editions of this period is the extent to which he was able to avail of the resources of the great libraries of Paris in their preparation; unreliable schemer though he was known to be, especially in dealing with rare books - one need only recall the incident of the Law/Bignon library³¹⁰ - he was given ready access to the Bibliothèque du Roi, to the library of Saint-Germain des Prés, and to innumerable other important collections belonging to communities and individuals. For the Bibliothèque du Roi we have some interesting records of books and manuscripts actually given out on loan to Lenglet: some of the 'Registres de prêt' are preserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale, and cover, with gaps, much of the period between 1740 and 1752.³¹¹ In these pages we find the names of many writers, major and minor, amongst the scores of unremembered readers, many of them members of the magistrature or ecclesiastics of one kind or another. The name of the borrower was entered in the register after the date, with sometimes a short-title of the book or manuscript being loaned, sometimes just a shelf-mark; the entry would be crossed out when the work was returned. There are around seventy entries for Lenglet in the extant registers, sometimes three or four for one month, which would indicate that he was a very frequent visitor to the library: presumably he went to consult material there on many occasions without borrowing any works or having his name entered in the register. The entries follow closely, for the most part, Lenglet's interests as manifested in the publications of the period: in 1741 we find him borrowing an Histoire de la médecine by John Freind,

and a Bibliotheca chimica, obviously related to the preparation of the Histoire de la philosophie hermétique.³¹² From 1742 onwards he borrows a vast quantity of manuscript material relating to French history - the 'mss de Comines', manuscripts from the Dupuy, Bethune and other collections on the history of Louis XI and Henri IV, editions of La Guisiade etc.³¹³ From 1747 we find him taking out manuscripts of Lactantius,³¹⁴ and in 1750 a book on metals in preparation for his edition of Barba's Métallurgie.³¹⁵ It is evident that Lenglet could not have perfected his editions to the same degree without the availability of this facility, a fact of which he is himself very conscious, offering profuse thanks in many of his Prefaces to the custodians of the royal library, the abbés Bignon and Sallier.³¹⁶ It is clear from the wording of his eulogies that they were themselves the arbiters of who should be granted the privilege of borrowing material; it was indeed Bignon who had brought about the opening of the library to the public in 1735, and Sallier presided personally over the public séances. We find a fascinating evocation of the conditions in the library at the time in the 'Eloge de M. l'abbé Sallier' published in the Histoire de l'Académie Royale des Inscriptions:

Depuis le moment où la Bibliothèque devint publique, M. l'abbé Sallier se fit un devoir indispensable de présider à l'assemblée de ces hommes studieux, qui viennent y chercher des lumières; dans les saisons les plus glacées, au milieu de ces vastes galeries, où il n'est permis d'introduire d'autre chaleur que celle de l'étude, nous l'avons vu [...] passer les matinées entières à répondre à ceux qui le consultoient, et à leur indiquer les matériaux qu'ils ignoroient souvent eux-mêmes, et qui se trouvoient aussi bien rangés et mieux développés dans sa tête que dans les catalogues les plus circonstanciés.³¹⁷

Given the personal nature of these essential contacts, Lenglet was careful to ingratiate himself with the administrators by using his knowledge of, and trade in, rare books to their advantage. In a letter to Passionei in 1754 he speaks of a rare edition of De l'interne

consolation (1554) of which the Cardinal is anxious to buy a copy:

Lenglet tells him that he donated his own copy of this edition to the royal library two years previously, but if he fails to procure another one for the Cardinal he will ask the abbé Sallier to buy a copy which is in the library of Gros de Boze, so that Lenglet will then be free to withdraw his copy from the Bibliothèque du Roi and send it to Passionei.³¹⁸ Such gifts, or simply loans, to the library were obviously Lenglet's way of maintaining the good will of the librarians. When one recalls that both Bignon and Sallier also acted as censors of Lenglet's works³¹⁹ one is again impressed by the extent to which these 'establishment' scholars could control and contain the output of impetuous, anarchic 'scribblers' such as Lenglet-Dufresnoy in this first half of the 18th century.

Politics and propaganda

Another of Lenglet's lifelong passions manifests itself strongly in this period in a sequence of works concerned with the current political situation in Europe. We may recall Lenglet's activities in Holland and Belgium around 1710, and his subsequent involvement with the Ministre de la Guerre Le Blanc. He was less actively involved in the political arena after Le Blanc's death in 1726, but he nonetheless continued the practice established in his student days of putting on paper his thoughts on any given 'contentious' situation, as he informed Cardinal Passionei in 1754:

Dans toutes les contestations, qui se présentent, j'en fait toujours quelques mémoires, seulement néanmoins pour ma propre

instruction et pour en pouvoir parler dans les compagnies; mais jamais pour les publier.³²⁰

The latter part of his statement is obviously not true of the works we are about to consider: these are just one indication of the degree of interest Lenglet paid to political events on an international scale, bringing to bear on the situation his knowledge of contemporary history, and his experience in diplomacy. In addition, he learnt much from personal contacts with many foreign visitors; again he informs Passionei:

Il me vient voir beaucoup d'etrangers de toutes les nations. Depuis quelques jours j'ai receu plusieurs Visites d'un Espagnol agé d'environ 35 à 40 ans homme de naissance qui a un gouvernement en Amerique.³²¹

On other occasions we find him writing a recommendation for a 'chanoine de Malte',³²² or as we have seen, being visited in his flat by the German Charles Jordan who was touring through Western Europe.³²³ This is also, of course, a tribute to the degree of fame he had acquired throughout the continent as a writer of note.

During the 1740 s France was heavily involved in the War of the Austrian Succession. The Comte de Belle-Isle and his supporters at court, young nobles keen to make their reputation in arms, formed ambitious plans on the death of the Emperor Charles VI; though they ran directly counter to the aging Fleury's careful politics, they succeeded in winning the support of Louis XV. They hoped to secure the election of a pro-French candidate, the Elector of Bavaria, to the Holy Roman Empire, and to share with Frederick of Prussia the Habsburg dominions, which Charles had tried to secure to his young grand-daughter, Maria-Theresa of Austria. The initial triumphs of the Franco-Prussian alliance were soon undermined, principally by the Machiavellian volte-face of

Frederick, who continually changed his policies; Maria-Theresa rallied her forces and her allies, bringing England and Holland into the war, and attacked Bavaria. There followed 6 years of what was for the French a largely inglorious war, their only real moment of triumph being the victory of the French forces at Fontenoy in 1745 under the leadership of Maurice de Saxe, the 'last glorious victory of the ancien régime'.³²⁴ In the peace treaty signed at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748 France could be seen to have gained nothing in these seven years of war.³²⁵

The guerre des plumes had become a common weapon during the War of the Spanish Succession, especially in England and Holland where there was a strongly expressed public opinion, and where the political press had developed very fast. The French had tried to exploit this development in order to accentuate the divisions among their enemies, chiefly by publishing books and pamphlets supposedly written by a citizen of the enemy nation, who tries to persuade his fellow-countrymen of the justice of the French cause and the need to cease hostilities against such a potentially friendly nation. Attempts were even made to give the publications the material appearance of books in the supposed country of origin, following typographical traditions in the style of the signatures, use of coloured print etc. It is unlikely that the populations of the alien country were fooled by these productions, written, after all, in a foreign language; nonetheless many of these works were expressly, if secretly, commissioned by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as had been the case, for example, with Les Intérêts de l'Angleterre mal entendus published by the abbé Du Bos in 1703.³²⁶ Such were the well-worn techniques adopted by Lenglet in three publications regarding the War of the Austrian Succession; we cannot be certain that these

works were not commissioned by interested parties in France, but there is some evidence to suggest that Lenglet worked mainly alone and on his own initiative, his efforts being nonetheless tolerated, if not encouraged after the event, by the administration.

The Lettres, négociations et pièces secrètes, pour servir à l'histoire des Provinces-Unies et de la guerre présente, et de suite ou de confirmation aux Lettres de S.E.M. Van-Hoey³²⁷ was conceived of as a sequel to a volume published in 1743 of the Lettres et négociations de M. Van Hoey, Ambassadeur à la Cour de France, with the colophon 'A Londres, chez John Nourse'.³²⁸ Van Hoey, in his letters to his government, had tried to convince it of the unadvisability of taking an active part in the war on the side of their Austrian allies against France, as it seemed to be obliged to do under the terms of the treaty of Vienna of 1731. A journalist in the Jugements sur quelques ouvrages nouveaux asserted that:

Ces lettres, qui n'avoient pas été écrites pour être publiées, l'ont été par une faction ennemie, pour nuire à cet habile Ministre.³²⁹

This work was followed very quickly by a Recueil de pièces secrètes et intéressantes, tirées des registres des Etats Généraux des Etats d'Hollande [...] pour et contre la fameuse question, si les Provinces Unies sont obligées de remplir la garantie qui résulte du Traité de Vienne de 1731, quoique la Cour de Vienne n'y ait point satisfait, ostensibly published by the same John Nourse.³³⁰ This has the appearance of an edition quickly put together by a bookseller anxious to exploit the interest shown by the public in the Van Hoey letters. Lenglet, however, took the opportunity of offering his collection as simply a second edition of the above work: the 'Avis de l'Imprimeur' makes this express claim, which is, of course, substantiated by the colophon, the familiar 'A Londres, chez

John Nourse',³³¹ adding that the 'Avertissement' (by Lenglet), is the same as that of the 'première édition'. The supposed publisher states:

Jé n'avais d'abord donné que les Pièces nues et originales; mais depuis l'on a fait pour moi une estimable découverte de beaucoup de ces même pièces accompagnées de Lettres, de notes et d'éclaircissements, qui mettent dans un grand jour les questions agitées présentement.³³²

A cursory glance at the Recueil de pièces secrètes et intéressantes, discloses Lenglet's subterfuge: not only does it not contain his 'Avertissement', but in fact, with the exception of a few pieces, Lenglet's work is composed of entirely new material. Most of this is of French origin, in contrast to the original collection, such as, for example, the letters and 'mémoires' from the French court presented to the government of the United Provinces by the ambassador, the Marquis de Fénelon, liberally annotated by the abbé. Yet Lenglet cleverly pleads the 'objectivity' of his collection:

Ce [n'est] point ici [...] un de ces Ouvrages anonymes, dans lesquels un Auteur, à l'abri de l'obscurité qui le couvre, donne ses préjugés et ses passions pour des principes certains et des maximes invariables. Ce sont des Pièces qui portent avec elles le caractere de leur authenticité;³³³

he is clearly hoping to disarm the reader with his reasonable tone.

His most significant contribution is a sequence of three letters, 'qui peuvent servir à la connaissance de l'Etat présent de l'Europe, et plus particulièrement des Provinces Unies des Pays-Bas',³³⁴ in which Lenglet adopts the persona of a citizen of the United Provinces, who was formerly involved in public life. He lends credibility to this subterfuge by recounting a number of anecdotes concerning negotiations which took place during the War of the Spanish Succession, in which he, as we have seen, was personally involved, though on the other side from that which he would now have the Dutch reader believe. In the first of his letters

Lenglet defends the legitimacy of the election of Charles VII, former elector of Bavaria, as Holy Roman Emperor, against the opposition of the Austrians who had put forward Francis of Lorraine, son-in-law of the former Emperor Charles VI. While speaking with respect of the 'auguste Reine de Hongrie' (Maria-Theresa), the ally of his supposed country, he tries to insinuate that the new Emperor will be less belligerent towards his neighbours in Europe than was the powerful house of Austria.³³⁵ The second letter discusses the question of the rightful succession to the thrones of Bohemia and Hungary in the event, which now pertains, of the German and Spanish branches of the houses of Austria lacking direct male descendants. Lenglet claims to have seen the act of a secret treaty between King Phillip III of Spain and the Archduke Ferdinand, which was communicated to him by the Marquis de Santa-Cruz at the Congress of Soissons,³³⁶ and which established that in the above event the succession would pass to the females of the Spanish branch, and their descendants, male or female; thus, he argues, the terms of the Pragmatic Sanction by which Charles VI tried to assure the succession of his daughter to the Habsburg dominions are null and void, and Louis XV of France or Phillip V of Spain, not Maria-Theresa, are the rightful heirs to Bohemia and Hungary.³³⁷ The third letter adopts a different strategy: here Lenglet argues convincingly on the dangers of war, and especially wars of conquest, for a small state, particularly an 'Etat populaire' which is heavily dependent on its foreign trade. He quotes pertinently in support of his arguments from Jean de Witt, Bayle and Puffendorff;³³⁸ this is an impressive demonstration of his abilities to draw on his wide reading in support of a specific political argument, and indicates why he was consulted so regularly by different interest groups. Lenglet reiterates similar arguments in a 'Lettre sur le Discours de S.E.M. le

Marquis de Fénelon',³³⁹ which he publishes together with that Discours.

This work was, not surprisingly, very well received by the French. Even the caustic abbé Desfontaines was highly adulatory, while pretending in his review to believe in its Dutch origins:

Ce Recueil mérite d'être lu attentivement, puisqu'on y voit une exposition claire et simple des démarches que S.M.T.C. s'est vu obligée de faire, et la lecture en doit faire d'autant plus d'impression, que cette exposition est l'aveu même d'un Compatriote Hollandois [...]. On n'a rien vu sur cette matiere, on ne l'a pas même encore bien entendue. Ce Recueil me paroît mériter d'ailleurs une si grande attention par les faits anecdotes qu'il renferme, que j'en pourrai parler plus amplement dans la suite.³⁴⁰

Secousse, in a letter to Bouhier, likewise praises the work, while guarding the anonymity of its author:

L'ouvrage est bien fait et il est rempli de pièces curieuses et d'anecdotes singulières. J'en connais l'auteur; mais il ne m'est pas permis de le nommer. Il travaille à un nouveau volume.³⁴¹

This 'nouveau volume' no doubt refers to a work in the same vein but in a rather different style published in 1745: L'Europe pacifiée par l'équité de la reine de Hongrie, ou Distribution légale de la succession d'Autriche,³⁴² ostensibly by a 'M. Albert Van-Heussen, Seigneur de Zeverghem et d'Ottersem, Conseiller, Pensionnaire de la Ville de Gand', and carrying a Brussels imprint. In his foreword the author declares:

J'ai cru rendre service au Public et en particulier à l'Auguste Reine de Hongrie, de publier la Consultation, que l'on exigea de moi il y a quelque tems,

which statement may in fact be more than just a subterfuge. The tone of the lengthy 'Dedication' to Maria-Theresa is extremely vicious,³⁴³ and she is accused of every possible crime: she is unchristian, cruel, ruthless, not to mention 'le mépris qu'elle a pour les premiers et les plus essentiels principes du Droit des Gens et même de la Loi naturelle'.³⁴⁴

The dissertation which forms the main bulk of the work again addresses

itself especially to the Dutch, reiterating the arguments, and repeating the anecdotes of the preceding work, though the situation has changed somewhat with the death of the Emperor Charles VII early in 1745.³⁴⁵

Lenglet concentrates particularly on one aspect of the problem:

Une question intéressante, si la nullité de la Pragmatique étant prouvée, il y a ouverture à la succession d'Autriche, et à qui cette succession peut être dévolue par les Loix du Droit Public.³⁴⁶

He elaborates on all the claims which could be made against the Queen's domains, pointing out the various ways of diminishing her power base. It is not surprising therefore that Déon de Beaumont should have written of this work in 1755 that 'Il y a dans cet ouvrage des faits hardis qui le font rechercher'.³⁴⁷

One curious addition to the work is a 'Mémoire sur le Général Seckendorff',³⁴⁸ dated 12th August 1744, which begins:

La personne qui envoie ce Mémoire, connaît Seckendorff depuis 34 ans, qu'il quitta le service de Prusse, pour prendre celui de l'Empereur Joseph.

Lenglet relates how he came to know Seckendorff during the war in 1710, when they were both attached to Prince Eugene. He claims that in 1711 'je pratiquai Seckendorff en Hollande, et nous nous rendîmes ensemble à l'armée des Alliés', where it seemed to the abbé that Seckendorff was not held in high regard by the generals: they looked on him as a man who would sell himself to the highest bidder. This was likewise his reputation in Vienna, where Lenglet knew him in 1721. The abbé warns therefore that Seckendorff, now in charge of Charles VII's troops, should not be trusted as an ally. In a note, presumably added at the time of publishing, we are informed that:

L'Evenement a justifié la vérité de ce Mémoire, et l'on a vu que Seckendorff a trahi non seulement la France, ce qui ne seroit pas étonnant, mais encore l'Empereur Charles VII son Maître.³⁴⁹

One might wonder what the point was of publishing such a document after the event. It would appear that he had first sent this 'Mémoire' in manuscript form to the Minister for Foreign Affairs, as he informs M. de Malesherbes in 1754:

M. le Comte d'Argenson peut se souvenir qu'au milieu du mois d'août 1744, il reçut à Metz un mémoire sur le Général Seckendorff, où il faisait connaître le peu de confiance qu'on devait avoir en cet officier. Ce mémoire fut envoyé au Ministre par l'abbé Lenglet.³⁵⁰

It is clear that the Minister paid no heed to Lenglet's 'warning', as the abbé underlines in a note in his other 'political' publication of this year, the Lettres d'un pair de la Grande-Bretagne:

L'on vient de m'assurer que l'on avoit averti les Ministres du Roi de France des trahisons anciennes et modernes du Général Seckendorff. Mais apparemment que par égard pour l'Empereur, ils n'ont pas cru devoir agir contre cet indigne mercenaire.³⁵¹

It would seem then that Lenglet's prime motivation in publishing this 'Mémoire' was pique at having been ignored by the authorities, and a desire to lend himself importance as a governmental advisor.

The third in this group of publications was the Lettres d'un pair de la Grand-Bretagne-à Milord archevêque de Cantorbéri, sur l'état présent des affaires de l'Europe, traduites de l'anglais par le chevalier Edward Melton, this time purportedly published in London:³⁵² in fact it bears a close typographical relationship to L'Europe pacifiée, and being also published in the same year is very probably the product of the same publishing house. As is clear from the title, this work addresses itself to an English public; the central section, the 'Lettres' themselves, underlines the cost to them of continuing the war, and again debates the issues involved in the election of a new Emperor. The 'lord' suggests that the kings of Poland, Sardinia, and Prussia would all be suitable candidates; the Catholics might, of course, object to the latter on the grounds that

a Protestant could not be elected as Holy Roman Emperor, but it is up to the English to put forward such a proposal, which would be both useful and reasonable, and to prove to the rest of Europe that 'nous sommes tous Chrétiens, et qu'il ne faut point admettre ces distinctions arbitraires d'une Communion à l'autre, distinctions uniquement introduites par l'esprit de domination et de partialité'.³⁵³ Lenglet no doubt intended this comment for his own government; it is not the only double-edged remark which he slips into the mouth of this useful Englishman. In a note on the 'Discours de M. Le Camus, Premier Président de la Cour des Aydes' addressed to Louis XV, he says:

Les Français sont si idolâtres de leur Roi, qu'ils ne peuvent s'empêcher de le louer avec excès, devraient-ils même le faire aux dépens de leur propre réputation; en quoi ils ne nous ressemblent pas.³⁵⁴

Such comments, where Lenglet exploits his ambiguous position to the limit to give expression to some of those opinions which were elsewhere severely censored, must lead one to raise again the question of whether the French government was in any way involved in the publication, especially in view of the fact that it was never French policy to put Frederick forward as a candidate for the Empire.³⁵⁵ Happily we find evidence that the piece had, in fact, been given a permission tacite in a letter from Voltaire to his old school friend, the Marquis d'Argenson, Ministre des Affaires Etrangères. The poet was deeply angered by a passage in the work where Lenglet had attacked the former 'Garde des Sceaux', M. de Chauvelin:³⁵⁶

Mais il faut que je vous parle de la lettre à un archevêque de Cantorbéri, écrite par un mauvais prêtre nommé Langlet. Vous savez qu'il y dit tout net que m. de Chauvelin reçut cent mille guinées des Anglais pour le traité de Séville. Cent mille guinées! L'abbé Langlet ne sait pas que cela fait plus de 2,500,000 livres. Si cela n'était que ridicule, passe; mais une calomnie atroce fait toujours plus de bien que de mal au calomnié. M. de Chauvelin a une grande famille. On trouve affreux qu'on ait imprimé une injure si indécente. Les indifférents disent qu'il n'est pas permis d'attaquer ainsi des ministres, que l'exemple est dangereux, et l'on se plaint du

lieutenant de police. Celui-ci dit que c'est l'affaire de Gros de Bose,³⁵⁷ et Gros de Bose dit que c'est la vôtre, que vous avez jugé la pièce imprimable; et moi je dis que non; qu'on vous a envoyé l'ouvrage comme étant fait en pays étranger, et que vous avez répondu simplement que l'auteur prenait le parti de la France contre la maison d'Autriche; que vous n'aviez répondu que sur cet article, et que d'ailleurs vous êtes loin d'approuver une pièce mal écrite, mal conçue, pleine de sottises et de calculs faux. Fais-je bien, fais-je mal?³⁵⁸

It is interesting to note in this letter the tacit understanding on the subject of works purportedly printed 'à l'étranger', to which we have seen Lenglet refer in almost identical terms, and the way in which the wily Voltaire insinuates to the Minister a way of retracting the protection which he had accorded to the work. It is somewhat ironic to see Voltaire, who on the recent occasion of Lenglet's imprisonment bemoaned the misfortunes of writers in France, now obviously seeking sanctions against him, though admittedly cases of personal slander cannot be equated with other subjects of literary censorship. It is in any case clear from the terms of the letter that the administration was not involved in the conception and publication of the work, but was happy to allow its free distribution in France; Voltaire's letter did not apparently succeed in changing d'Argenson's mind on the subject. We must not, of course, exclude the possibility of other interest groups playing some rôle in the affair. Gaston Zeller points out that the adversaries of Austria were numerous within the court and the army, Chauvelin himself, a man of Parliamentary stock, being ironically one of the most prominent:

Les guerres du XVI^e et du XVII^e siècle ont eu ce résultat, de faire naître aux yeux de beaucoup de Français un nouvel ennemi héréditaire, l'Empire des Habsbourg. Cet antagonisme de fraîche date [...] est surtout cérébral, entretenu par une littérature historique, ou pseudo-historique, à tendances politiques. Il n'en va pas moins jouer son rôle pendant tout le siècle;³⁵⁹

but any links between Lenglet and such factions must remain hypothetical. It must also be remembered that Frederick of Prussia was at this time winning for himself the respect and support of French literary men, and

this may have been a contributing factor in Lenglet's decision to propose him for Emperor. In the final analysis the main thrust of the 'lord's' letters was to cast a favourable light on the position and actions of Louis XV in the context of the war, and it was for this reason they were well received in France. The Mémoires de Trévoux reviewed the work, their only mildly pejorative remark being:

La Maison d'Autriche y est si mal traitée, que cette brochure peut passer à cet égard pour un Libelle,³⁶⁰

which comment could be applied in much stronger terms, as we have seen, to L'Europe pacifiée. Lenglet's biographer simply remarked discreetly: 'Cette Pièce est curieuse pour divers faits historique de nos jours'.³⁶¹

In a different context Lenglet was responsible for publishing, though not writing, a pamphlet on behalf of the Order of Malta entitled Relation de la conspiration tramée par le Bacha de Rhodes contre l'isle de Malthe.³⁶² This relates how Mustafa, ^PBacha of Rhodes, had been released from captivity by the Knights of Malta in response to intervention on his behalf by Louis XV; but having been released from prison and given the 'freedom' of the island he had proceeded to plan a revolt of the Turkish slaves, 'dont on donne ici la Relation qu'on a reçue de Monsieur le Commandeur de Viguiier, Commandant des Gardes du Grand-Maitre, et qui devait lui-même être assassiné le premier, après son Altesse Eminentissime'.³⁶³ The ^PBacha was therefore re-arrested at the end of June 1749, and the Order sent an account of his crimes to the French king:

Afin que sa Majesté pleinement informée de l'horreur de son attentat, voulût bien permettre à l'Ordre de s'en faire raison suivant les Loix, en le livrant à la justice, d'autant plus que ce Barbare a violé le droit des Gens, et a manqué de reconnaissance pour les bontés de sa Majesté Très-Chrétienne.³⁶⁴

A copy of a letter by Lenglet addressed to 'un officier de confiance de Sa Majesté', which he sent to Passionei in Rome, gives us interesting information on the circumstances surrounding the publication of this pamphlet;³⁶⁵ the manuscript was apparently sent from Malta, and the abbé, having added a brief conclusion, had it printed at the expense of the Order. Interestingly, he tells us that 'il avait été défendu d'en vendre aucun exemplaire, comme chose pas convenable'. Lenglet had procured an 'Approbation et Permission' from Nicolas-René Berryer, Lieutenant Général de Police, a personal friend of his,³⁶⁶ but when the pamphlet came to the attention of the Marquis de Puisieux, Ministre des Affaires Etrangères, he did not approve of its distribution, and ordered Berryer to suppress it. Lenglet presented himself at the latter's office with 8 copies, which he declared to be all he had left, and explained that the other copies had already been distributed, one to the King himself, one to the Pope, others to several of the Cardinals, all the foreign Ministers, all the Dukes, Peers, and Marshals of France, the Bailiffs and Commanders of the Order of Malta, 'enfin à toutes les personnes, dont les familles peuvent aspirer à l'ordre'. He had even sent copies to Italy and Portugal. Berryer took note of Lenglet's explanations and analyses, and the latter asked him to pass on to the Marquis de Puisieux his concern that the security of the island should not be threatened again by the French putting undue pressure on the Knights to release their prisoner. It is clear, then, from the evidence of the pamphlet, and from other comments in his correspondence with Passionei, that Lenglet had many friends in the Order of Malta in France, and it was at their request and on their behalf that he undertook this publication.³⁶⁷ Again the range of his involvements and activities must astound the twentieth-century reader.

The last publication of the 1740 s bears a relationship both to these 'political' works and to the historical editions of the same decade. This was an edition of the Mémoires de la Régence, first published by the Chevalier de Piossens in 1729, with significant additions by Lenglet.³⁶⁸ It would appear in fact that the abbé had first planned to publish two of the essays included in this edition separately: the 'Réflexions sur la conspiration projetée par le prince de Cellamare',³⁶⁹ and an 'Histoire abrégée du système des finances'.³⁷⁰ The former is a 40-page history of the famous conspiracy which, as we have seen, Lenglet had helped to uncover. The information he had acquired when he played mouton in the Bastille, and his subsequent relations with Le Blanc, enable him to give a detailed and anecdotal account of the intrigue, and its discovery, which had not hitherto been made public - largely, no doubt, to protect the powerful interests and great families who had been involved. It is written in a very personal mode, the author being, of course, anonymous: he refers fairly openly to his own role in the affair, also mentioning his part in the aborted 'Ferrand' conspiracy, and eulogises the Regent for his tolerance and willingness to pardon an offence, 'dont je suis moi même une preuve'.³⁷¹ He attacks the Mémoires de la Régence and the Vie du Duc d'Orléans for their inaccurate accounts of the affair.³⁷² He stresses that his expressions of admiration for the late Regent, who, as we have seen, had granted him a royal pension for his services, are totally disinterested:

Qu'on ne prenne pas ce que je dis de ce grand Prince pour des éloges; ce sont des veritez que je confirme par des faits réels. A quoi aboutiroient mes éloges, puisqu'inconnu comme je suis, je

ne cherche point à en tirer de recompense. Je travaillerois inutilement à la meriter d'un Prince qui n'est plus;³⁷³

at least one may appreciate in Lenglet a certain sense of loyalty to his benefactors.

The 'Histoire abrégée du système des finances' gives a detailed account of the Law affair; it takes a reasonably balanced and objective approach, outlining the positive elements in the system as it was originally conceived, and the advantages to the economy of the increased circulation of assets. Its failure, the author suggests, was largely due to the inconsistency and unevenness of governmental policy which undermined people's faith in the system, coupled with the uncontrolled issue of excessive numbers of shares whose value was artificially inflated to an untenable level. It would appear that Lenglet himself may not have written this essay; Charles Jordan recounts that on a visit to the abbé in 1733:

J'y ai vû en ms. une Histoire du Systeme des Finances de 1720. Mr. l'Abbé m'a assuré, que M. H*** en étoit l'Auteur.³⁷⁴

It seems likely that this refers to the same essay, but I have found no further indications of the true identity of the author.

That these, and perhaps other essays, were destined to form part of a new Histoire de la Régence seems likely in view of a comment in a police file on Lenglet, dated 1751:

Il voulait faire imprimer une histoire de la regence que M. Berryer a empêché parce qu'il y avoit dedans quantité de choses fortes contre des familles en place. C'etoit David jeune qui en étoit chargé et qui la presenta au Magistrat le premier janvier 1748.³⁷⁵

A letter couched in deliberately obscure terms, written in October 1748, would seem to refer to parts of this work, and to efforts on Lenglet's part to have them published. It may have been addressed to someone in

the Administration through whom the abbé hoped to acquire a tacit approval for publication:

Monsieur,

J'ai l'honneur de vous envoyer quatre pièces que j'ai eu ce matin seulement. Vous y remarquerez la vérité de ce que je vous ai marqué jeudi dernier. Je me flatte que la direction de cette affaire ne sortira pas de vos mains. Je vous say équitable et instruit: mais au cas qu'on voulut faire quelque chose à mon préjudice, je prendrai la liberté de m'adresser à Monseigneur le duc d'Orléans, de qui je suis connu, et je luy marquerois qu'on me veut inquiéter pour avoir fait l'apologie de feu Son Altesse Royale: j'en ferois même présenter un mémoire a S.A.R. Madame: et je me flatte que je serois écouté, d'autant plus qu'on n'a rien dit à ceux qui ont fait paroître les Mémoires de la Régence et la Vie du feu duc d'Orléans, qui dés-honorent ce prince.³⁷⁶

The reference to the Mémoires de la Régence, to which Lenglet also makes a pejorative reference in the text of the 'Réflexions sur la conspiration...', suggests that he was not at this time considering the coupling of his Histoire with that work. It was presumably on the failure of this former plan that a new project was formed to re-edit the Mémoires, with significant corrections and additions. We cannot be sure if David was still involved, for the book was finally published under a false imprint, 'A Amsterdam', although it has all the typographical features of a work printed in France.³⁷⁷ Whether it was published surreptitiously, or with the tacit approval of the authorities, is also an open question. Michault remarked that Lenglet himself had qualified the Mémoires de la Régence as a book in which there is 'trop de hardiesse et de témérité',³⁷⁸ continuing:

Il a donc été lui-même bien hardi et bien téméraire de le remettre une seconde fois dans le commerce de la Librairie, et d'y ajouter d'autres Pièces pour y servir en quelque sorte de passeport.³⁷⁹

He does, however, add that the quality of the work must justify the abbé to some extent, for Piossens' Mémoires is a model of objectivity, 'une Histoire authentique solidement établie sur l'autorité irréfragable de tout un Royaume, et même de l'Europe entière'.³⁸⁰ This is a judgement

with which the publisher does not agree, at least not openly: in the 'Avis' he informs us that he had approached 'un homme connu, qui avait eu quelque part à divers mouvements de ces temps', who corrected not only factual errors and imperfections of style, but 'bien des erreurs ou pour mieux dire des égarements, où l'esprit de partialité avait précipité le 1er auteur, qui par sa conduite ne s'est montré rien moins qu'Historien'.³⁸¹ The changes and additions introduced by Lenglet were then significant, but were not, alas, identified in the notes: another example of that désinvolte attitude to editorial practice which we have already discussed. Many of the adaptations were efforts to tone down the original text and make it more acceptable to the French government, as for example its condemnations of the Regent and his administration, and its consequent defence of the Parlements and the 'Appelants' in the Unigenitus affair.³⁸²

There were other interesting additions besides the two essays we have already mentioned.³⁸³ One of these was a 'Mémoire sur le gouvernement, présenté à Monsieur le Duc d'Orléans, par M. le Comte de Boulainvilliers',³⁸⁴ a work obviously written around the time of Louis XIV's death, and which we have not found listed in any of the bibliographies of the Count's work. The writer offers advice to the Regent on the introduction of reforms in the fiscal system, and expresses strong criticism of the previous régime whose administration was 'exercé sans règle et sans théorie, au hazard des événemens'. This was presumably one of those manuscripts of which Lenglet spoke when he published Boulainvilliers' 'Essai de métaphysique' in 1731, and which he promised to publish at a later date.³⁸⁵ Another item was entitled 'Réflexions et considérations sur le Mémoire des formalités nécessaires pour

valider la reconciation du Roi d'Espagne';³⁸⁶ this is an anonymous commentary on a manuscript 'Mémoire' by Boulainvilliers,³⁸⁷ and is devoted largely to the question of whether the right of the king of France to make laws is subject to the approval of the Pairs du Royaume. Boulainvilliers had apparently claimed that it was, basing his theory on what he believed to have been the accepted practice at the foundation of the monarchy. The author of the 'Réflexions' contests his conclusions, asserting that the custom and practice of recent centuries must override earlier forms of association. The essay is closely argued and maintains a consistently elegant style throughout, which is not reminiscent of Lenglet's other writings; there is, however, no positive clue to the identity of the writer.

Due no doubt to the illegal status of the edition its appearance was not commented on by the major periodicals, and so we have little evidence to help us assess its impact; the Lelong-Fontette bibliography, however, remarked on this and the original 1729 edition that 'Les curieux veulent avoir les deux Editions, à cause des changements qui ont été faits dans la seconde'.³⁸⁸ There can be no doubt that this work, like Lenglet's other 'political' pieces of this period, did indeed attract a public avid for anecdotes concerning the contemporary history of their country and of the court, and had the advantage for editor and publisher of a quicker turnover than the more scholarly works to which the abbé was simultaneously devoting his efforts. It is nonetheless these 'serious' editions, together with the augmented reissues of his consecrated successes such as the two Méthodes, which constitute Lenglet's major achievement in this decade, and indeed mark a high point in his publishing career. He had now achieved international fame as a scholar, and though his

reputation was still tarnished with many ambiguities he had won a kind of grudging, ironic respect from those more cautious and consistent Academicians who collaborated in his historical researches, albeit at an arm's length distance.

Notes to Chapter V

1. See above, Chapter III, p.120.
2. In a letter to his sister in 1752 (Delort, Détention des philosophes, ii, 106-7), Lenglet suggests that the outstanding rentes due to him should enable her to discharge debts to the tune of 592 livres: normally the rentes were paid twice yearly, which would suggest an income of c. 1000 livres, but as we cannot be sure that Lenglet had not let his interest accumulate over a longer period I have kept my calculations to a minimum of 500 livres p.a. We do not know the source of these rentes; they may have been given to him by his father, or he may have invested money in his younger days, for example the fruits of his spying activities: see above Chapter III, p.87.
3. Lenglet's addresses, and the reasons for his changing residence, are given in a factum entitled Mémoire signifié, Cause à plaider à la chambre criminelle du Chastelet de Paris, pour M. Adrien Maillart... contre M. Nicolas Lenglet du Frenoy..., Paris, Paulus-du-Mesnil, 1741, pp.2 and 7.
4. See description of the apartment in the 'Inventaire après décès, 31 Jan. 1755': Minutier, Etude XCV, Liasse 238.
5. See letter Lenglet to his sister Mme de la Barre, 14 Jan. 1752, in Delort, Détention des philosophes, ii, 105.
6. Bastille, 10880, f.267, published by François Ravaisson, Archives de la Bastille, xii, 373.
7. Ravaisson, Archives, xii, 375.
8. Delort, Détention des philosophes, ii, 107.
9. Ibid.
10. Michault, Mémoires, p.46.
11. Denis-François Secousse in his letters to the Président Bouhier makes reference to 'notre pauvre ami Mr. Maillart' (Correspondance littéraire du Président Bouhier, ed. Duranton, i, pp.24, 52, 62, and 65).
12. Mémoire ... pour M. Adrien Maillart, p.3.
13. See the Mémoire, p.6; Secousse describes the library in a letter to Bouhier as 'belle et surtout curieuse pour les copies d'un grand nombre de pièces historiques, de Chartes, de diplômes, qu'il eu soin de faire copier exactement, lorsque sa profession les lui faisait passer entre ses mains' (Letter 28 June 1743, in Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 62). Secousse himself bought a complete set of the Mercure de France (750 vols.) when the library was sold (ibid., p.65).

14. Paris, 1704, in-4°; second edition Paris, 1739, 2 vols. in-folio. H. Duranton describes the work as a 'travail très sérieux, mais curieusement brouillon, ce qui peut expliquer son mauvais débit' (Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 24N.).
15. See Mémoire, p.3: Lenglet had sold 6 to de Bure at 16 livres each, 36 to Gandouin at 13 livres 10 sous, and 24 to Bauche at 15 livres.
16. Ibid., p.10.
17. The letter is quoted in Maillart's Mémoire, p.6.
18. Ibid., pp.1 and 2.
19. Ibid., pp.7 and 11; Lenglet was looking for 3,000 livres in 'dommages-interêts'.
20. See letter 10 Oct. 1742 in Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 52.
21. Ibid.
22. Ibid., pp.62 and 65.
23. Mémoire, p.7.
24. Ibid., p.9.
25. Bibliothèque municipale de Tonnerre, ms. 'Correspondance et papiers de famille du Chevalier d'Eon', vol. v, letter 25 Apr. 1755.
26. See passage quoted below, Chapter VI, p.421.
27. See below, Chapter VI, pp.424-5.
28. L'Année littéraire, iii(1755), 134.
29. See Delort, Détention des philosophes, p.107.
30. Cf. Bibliography.
31. The seven volumes were published by de Bure in Paris from 1749-56.
32. Cf. Nouveaux mémoires, vii, 72-3. Lenglet was very likely responsible for a similar interference in Dom Calmet's Traité sur les apparitions: see below Chapter VI, p.405.
33. Nouveaux mémoires, vii, 73.
34. Michault, Mémoires, p.196.
35. Nouveaux mémoires, vii, 177.
36. See Bibliography, 56.01.

37. See below, Chapter VI, pp.415-6, for details of this incident.
38. Le géographe méthodique, ou Introduction à la géographie ancienne et moderne, à la chronologie et à l'histoire, Paris, Robinot, 1741-2.
39. Observations sur les écrits modernes, xxvii, pp.275-82 and pp.346-56; further attacks were made in succeeding volumes.
40. See Bibliography, 13.06.
41. Amsterdam, l'Honoré, 1743.
42. Lettre de M. de Gourné, p.35; 'le sieur Guyot' is, of course, Desfontaines.
43. See Thelma Morris, L'Abbé Desfontaines et son rôle dans la littérature de son temps (Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, xix)1961 , pp.71-2.
44. No title, no publisher, dated 'A Paris, ce 17 Decembre 1742' (in Bibliothèque Nationale, G31824bis).
45. For details of this affair see Morris, L'Abbé Desfontaines, pp.68-73.
46. See the Lettre de M. de Gourné, p.32
47. Michault, in his list of 'Ouvrages auxquels l'Abbé Lenglet a eu part', declares: 'Je sçais qu'il a fourni à divers Journalistes des Extraits très-bien faits de plusieurs Livres importants, et que ces Articles ont occupé une place honorable dans les Feuilles Périodiques où ils ont été employés'. (Mémoires, p.194).
48. Ibid., p.58.
49. On the history of the work see La Henriade, ed. O.R. Taylor, 2nd edition, (Oeuvres complètes de Voltaire, vol.ii), Geneva, Institut et Musée Voltaire, 1970, 'Introduction'.
50. Voltaire, Correspondence, ed. Theodore Besterman, D.1635.
51. Prault did finally publish a new edition in 2 vols. 12° in 1746 (see Taylor, op.cit., pp.242-3).
52. The edition was anonymous, but Voltaire himself identified 'l'abbé Lenglet' in his replies to the latter's notes which he published in the 1746 'Prault' edition (see Taylor, op.cit., pp.386 ff.), and he repeated this attribution explicitly in a letter to Johann S. König, c. 4 June 1753 (Correspondence, D.5307).
53. La Henriade, ed. 1741, p.iii.
54. Ibid., p.cxv.

55. See Bibliography, 34.01.
56. La Henriade, p.cxv.
57. I have dealt with the composition of Voltaire's '1733' edition in a separate article (to be published in Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century).
58. The engraving on the title-page, and the head-piece for the 'Avertissement du libraire', are undoubtedly printed from the 1728 plates: as late as 1736 Voltaire was still trying to recover these from England (cf. Correspondence, D.1040 and D.1202).
59. See Bibliography.
60. Cf. Taylor, op.cit., p.84.
61. Ibid., p.87.
62. Ibid., pp.87-8, and p.243.
63. Ibid., p.88.
64. See ibid., p.87 and pp.242 ff.
65. See Bibliography, 33.01. The original edition of Salmon's work was published in Paris by Charles Angot in 1672, 2 vols. in-12.
66. Bibliothèque des philosophes chimiques, i, 'Avertissement'.
67. See for example ibid., i, pp.cvi and cxliv, and also Lenglet's 'Avertissement'. Re tendencies towards 'le naturalisme' in alchemical writings see Jean Ehrard, L'idée de nature en France dans la première moitié du XVIIIe siècle, Paris, S.E.V.P.E.N., 1963, i, 45-6.
68. The Histoire de la philosophie hermétique: see below p.297.
69. Année littéraire, vi (1754), 176 (Article pp.166-76).
70. See Jacques-Charles Brunet, Manuel du libraire et de l'amateur de livres, Paris, Maisonneuve et Larose, 1860-5, i, 932, and A.-A. Barbier, Dictionnaire des ouvrages anonymes, (3rd ed.), Paris, Daffis, 1872-89, i, 415.
71. See Bibliography, 36.01. On the Histoire cf. Kay Wilkins, 'The irrational in 18th-century France', Studies on Voltaire, xcl (1975), 175-6.
72. 'Le Philalèthe' was Thomas Vaughan Philalethes, an alchemist known as Eugenius, who published the first version of this work in London in 1675 (H. Moseley) under the title Euphrates, or the Waters of the East, being a short discourse of that secret fountain, whose water flows from fire, and carries on it the beams of the sun and moon; the Latin version was published in 1699.

73. Histoire de la philosophie hermétique, p.iv.
74. Bibliothèque française, xxxvi(1743), 96 and 102.
75. Philosophie hermétique, i, p.iv.
76. Ibid., pp.ix-x.
77. Ms. Nouv.acq.franç. 4300, f.47 (letter 27 Apr. 1742).
78. Observations sur les écrits modernes, xxviii(1742), pp.190-1; for other articles see ibid., pp.3-8; La Bibliothèque française, xxxvi(1743), 95-105; La Bibliothèque raisonnée des ouvrages des savants de l'Europe, xxix, 43-54.
79. Bibliothèque raisonnée, xxix, 46.
80. Ibid., p.52. Etienne-François Geoffroy (1672-1731) was a famous physician; his father, an apothecary, had had him educated by some of the best scientists of the time. He was admitted to the Académie des Sciences in 1699 (Biog.univers., xvi, 208-9).
81. Observ. sur les écrits mod., xxviii, 191.
82. The first series of Mémoires de l'Académie Royale des Sciences (Année 1666-1699), 11 vols., Paris, 1733-4, was followed by the Histoire de l'Académie [...] avec les mémoires de mathématique et de physique (Année 1699-1790), 93 vols., Paris, 1702-97. The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society were published continuously in London from 1665; only very limited segments of the series had been translated into French, the most recent being the Transactions philosophiques, 1731-6, trans. by M. de Brémond, Paris, 1738-41. It seems certain, then, that Lenglet consulted the English version.
83. British Library, ms. ADD.4057, f.94 (letter 1 Dec. 1741). A 'mémoire' containing Lenglet's questions, which evidently accompanied the letter, is unfortunately not conserved with it.
84. Lenglet mentions his brother in the Hist. de la phil. herm., ii, pp.xxiv and 101; re Jacques Lenglet de Percel see above Chapter I, pp. 9-11. Lenglet tells us that he had also heard accounts of Aluys' transmutations from the Duc de Richelieu, who had met Aluys in Vienna in 1726: 'Ce Seigneur plein d'esprit et d'honneur a vu non seulement la transmutation; mais il m'a fait l'honneur de me dire, que lui même l'avait faite deux fois sur l'or et plus de quarante fois sur l'argent; qu'il est sûr de n'avoir pas été trompé, ayant pris toutes les précautions qu'un homme d'esprit doit prendre pour n'être point le jouet des supercheries trop ordinaires dans ces occasions' (ibid., ii, 99).
85. Ibid., ii, 101.
86. L'Année littéraire, iii(1755), 138, and Michault, Mémoires, p.48, which follows de Beaumont's account word for word.

87. See below, Chapter VI, pp.398-9.
88. Hist. de la phil. herm., i, p.ix.
89. Minutier, XCV, 238, 'Inventaire, 31 Jan. 1755'.
90. Cf. La Bibliothèque française, xxxvi, 101. Jean Ehrard remarks à propos that 'l'utilité pratique de certaines recettes chimiques n'est pas sans conférer quelque poids aux vaines recherches des alchimistes' (op.cit., i, 38-9).
91. See for example Vat.Lat.9813, ff.69-70, (6 Jan. 1755), and f.32 (29 July 1754).
92. L'Année littéraire, iii(1755), 138.
93. Ehrard, op.cit., i, 38.
94. Ibid.
95. L'Encyclopédie, iii, 409, quoted by Ehrard, op.cit., i, 38.
96. Malouin censored Lenglet's Cours de chimie: see below Chapter VI, pp.398-9.
97. L'Encyclopédie, i, 248. Cf. Kay Wilkins, who from a study of eighteenth-century works on alchemy, concluded that 'the attitude of scepticism and caution predominated despite the support still given to alchemy, and serious scientific investigation relegated it more and more to the realm of fantasy ('The irrational...', p.180)
98. Hist. de la phil. herm., i, p.iv.
99. Amsterdam, F. Changuion; see Michault, Mémoires, p.199.
100. Hist. de la phil. herm., iii, 'Avertissement'. Jean Hellot (1685-1766), renowned for his work in the field of chemistry, was a member not only of the Académie des Sciences, but of the Royal Society in London (Biog.univers., xix, 78-9). Lenglet himself owned a copy of the Catalogue of the royal library (cf. Delort, Détention des philosophes, p.107).
101. Jacques Coeur (c. 1395-1456) was the son of a goldsmith from Bourges, and made his fortune in commercial trading. Charles VII first appointed him 'Maître de la monnaie' in his home town, but such was his ability that he was soon after promoted to the position of 'Premier argentier du Roi', with complete control of the royal finances. He continued his maritime commerce to become one of the biggest, and certainly most wealthy, traders in Western Europe. He loaned huge sums of money to the crown from his personal fortune, and was given titles of nobility in return. He was in general highly esteemed, but his displays of opulence provoked the jealousy of the courtiers, who succeeded in turning the king against him. He was accused of embezzlement, of abuse of power, and even of having

poisoned Agnès Sorel. In 1453 his estates were confiscated, and he was banished; he died in Rome some few years later (Biog.univers., vii, 527-8). Lenglet has twisted Coeur's history to suit his purpose of lampooning Orry.

102. The portrait in question is in the Hist. de la phil. herm., i, 248-63. Philibert Orry (d. 1747), first embarked on a military career, then bought a charge of Conseiller au Parlement de Paris, and was appointed Contrôleur Général des Finances by Cardinal Fleury in 1730. He improved the state of the public revenues by well-planned cut-backs in expenditure, and without increasing taxation. Though a capable administrator, 'his attempts at economy and his uncourtierlike personality made Orry one of the most hated men in France' (Alfred Cobban, A History of Modern France, London, Penguin, 1972, i, 60-1). The Pâris brothers, to whom his austere financial methods were by no means congenial, succeeded in bringing about his fall from grace in December 1745. Neither Orry, nor his successor de Machault whom Lenglet later attacked, deserved to be singled out as cruel exploiters of le peuple. (See Biog.univers., lxxvi, 123-5).
103. Hist. de la phil. herm., i, 250.
104. Ibid., p.252.
105. The 'vieillard' is Cardinal Fleury, under the traits of the Comte de Dunois. He is not treated so kindly in another passage: 'Jacques Coeur avoit la protection du comte de Dunois. Ce seigneur étoit âgé et protégeoit le nouveau ministre, parce que celui-ci rampoit bassement devant lui, beaucoup plus même que n'auroit fait un vil esclave. Avec l'âge, ce grand homme devint timide et, sentant sa faiblesse, il se livroit moins à des amis sages, capables de lui donner des conseils salutaires, qu'à des valets qui le flattoient sur ses grandes lumières et ses talents admirables pour les affaires. Jacques Coeur se mit au nombre de ces derniers et le servoit comme les vieillards veulent être servis' (ibid., pp.253-4).
106. Ibid., i, p.260.
107. See below, Chapter VI, pp.391 ff.
108. See L'Année littéraire, iii(1755), 127-8, and Michault, Mémoires, p.122.
109. Observations sur les écrits modernes, xxviii, 192.
110. I.e. the Journal d'Henri III: see below, pp.317 ff.
111. Letter Secousse to Bouhier, 10 Oct. 1742, in Correspondance littéraire du Président Bouhier, i, 54.
112. B.N.: Rés. R2512.
113. See Bibliography, 37.01.

114. See the 'Catalogue des livres de dévotion qui se trouvent chez le même libraire', bound at the back of some copies, which includes an Imitation de Jesus-Christ en forme de prières, possibly Lenglet's edition, and his Traité du secret de la confession.
115. See below, p.356. Louis, duc d'Orléans (1703-52), had retired from public life on the death of his wife in 1726, and devoted himself largely to the practice of religion. In 1742, the year of the publication of the Messe des fidèles, he went to live definitively in the abbey of Sainte-Geneviève (cf. Biog.univers., xxi, 374-5).
116. See Bibliography, 13.06.
117. Méthode pour étudier la géographie, ed. 1742, i, Part 2, p.482.
118. Charles d'Orléans de Rothelin (1691-1744), 'littérateur aimable autant qu'instruit', was a member of both the Académie Française and the Académie des Inscriptions; he had built up an exceptionally fine collection of medals and books (cf. Biog.univers., xxxvi, pp.557-8).
119. The 'Grands et petits voyages' were published under the title Collectiones peregrinationum in Indiam orientalem et Indiam occidentalem, in 25 vols. folio, by de Bry.
120. See Bibliography, 38.01.
121. Cf. Brunet, Manuel du libraire, iv, 148: 'Edition tirée a très-petit nombre'.
122. Méthode pour étudier la géographie, ed. 1768, i, 361.
123. Mémoires, p.201.
124. Paris, Didot, 1746-89, 20 vols., and the Hague, de Hondt, 1747-80, 25 vols.
125. Re the Oratorians and historical scholarship cf. Lionel Gossman, Medievalism and the ideologies of the Enlightenment, pp.5-7.
126. See Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 7-13 ('Présentation'), and Gossman, op.cit., pp.50-1 and passim.
127. The major work to which Secousse devoted his life was the Ordonnances des Roys de France de la troisième race recueillies par ordre chronologique, whose publication had been initiated by the government during the reign of Louis XIV. The Chancelier, d'Aguesseau, charged Secousse with its continuation: he published volumes II-IX between 1729 and 1755.
128. The Mémoires de Condé were, in fact, a collection of documents, mainly of Protestant origin, relating to the first religious war (1560-5), and first published in 1565-6 in Strasbourg by Pierre Estiard, 3 vols.; Secousse added a large number of other related documents, together with his own historical and critical notes. See Correspondance de

Bouhier, i, 17-18 N., and Henri Hauser, 'Du recueil intitulé Mémoires de Condé', Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine, xvi (1911), 50-61.

129. See letter Secousse to Bouhier, 15 Dec. 1738, in which Secousse thanks the Président for the manuscript of the 'Journal de Mr. l'abbé Brulart' which he had sent him, and which he wishes to publish at the head of 'la nouvelle édition des Mémoires de Condé que je prépare' (Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 17).
130. In describing the items in the Condé edition Michault states that 'L'Abbé Lenglet [...] avoit eu part lui-même au choix de ces différents Ouvrages, et [...] avoit conduit l'Edition' (Mémoires, p.180).
131. Nouv.acq.franç. 3344, f.53. It is interesting to note that the Journal des savants, in announcing the opening of subscriptions, speaks of 'les Editeurs' in the plural (June 1739, pp.378-9).
132. Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 71, letter 3 Mar. 1744.
133. Cf. Secousse's attitude as censor of the Journal de Henri III, pp.317-19 below.
134. Henri-François d'Aguesseau (1668-1751), from a family famous in the magistrature, had pursued a brilliant career in the Parlement before being appointed Chancellor in 1717. Despite long periods of disfavour with the administration, he was a popular minister; he devoted himself principally to judicial reforms, improving and standardising legislation. He had a passionate interest in things literary. (Biog.univers., i, 252-5). Lenglet claims that it was on his express request that he later undertook the Journal de Henri III: cf. p.316 below.
135. Michault just gives Paris in his attribution (Mémoires, p.179), but the colophon on both versions of the title-page designates Rollin as distributor; he was also to publish Lenglet's Supplément. The typographical features of the edition reinforce the Paris attribution.
136. On the subject of the permissions tacites see François Furet, 'La "librairie" du royaume de France au XVIIIe siècle' in Livre et société dans la France du XVIIIe siècle, Paris, Mouton, 1965, i, 3-31, and William Hanley, 'The policing of thought: censorship in eighteenth-century France', Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, clxxxiii, 280-3. Cf. p.317 below re the Journal de Henri III.
137. Michault, Mémoires, p.178.
138. Letter 16 May 1743, Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 57.
139. See letter from Secousse, ibid., p.60: 'L'Abbé Lenglet ayant déclaré que c'était Rollin qui avait fait les frais de l'impression, celui-ci n'a pu en disconvenir'.
140. The typographical composition of this volume is distinctly different from that of the first 5 volumes; features such as the arabic

signatures and catchwords on every page seem to have been deliberately employed to give it a foreign appearance (cf. Bibliography, 41.01).

141. Manuscript found in a copy of the Supplément: ms. shelf number to be allocated.
142. He declares that he has applied a 'contrepoison' in the form of an assertion of the 'Principes incontestables du Droit des gens': Supplément, i, p.xvi.
143. See, for example, ibid., pp.vi ff.
144. See ibid., pp.xxii ff.
145. Méthode, ii, 280-2 (cancellanda).
146. Supplément, p.xxvi.
147. The reason given for Lenglet's subsequent arrest was that he had 'composé et fait imprimer le 6eme volume des Mémoires de Condé, dans lequel il a malgré les deffenses de M. le Chancelier, inséré une addition que ce magistrat avait prohibé' (Bastille 11534, f.301; in Arch. de la Bastille, ed. Ravaisson, xii, 237). A note on f.300, in a different hand, uses the term 'des passages' instead of 'une addition'. Cardinal Passionei, Lenglet's correspondant in Rome, was in no doubt about which item had caused Lenglet's downfall. On 24 May he wrote to the Président Bouhier: 'L'Abbé Lenglet a fait en sa vie, tant d'étourderies que je ne m'étonne pas de la dernière. Cependant il fallait être enragé pour imprimer à présent à Paris de toutes les oeuvres de Boucher le plus furieux Ligueur, qui fut jamais, l'Apologie la plus abominable' (Franç. 24421, ff.178-9).
148. In a letter of 16 May Secousse tells Bouhier that he has sent him a copy of the Supplément along with the last volumes of his own set (Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 57); the distribution by the book-seller must have begun earlier.
149. See Félix Rocquain, L'Esprit révolutionnaire avant la Révolution, Paris, Plon, 1878, p.503, who says that the Supplément was 'supprimé par ordre du Conseil d'Etat le 28 avril 1743'; in view of the evidence of Lenglet's arrest the date was undoubtedly the 28 March, not April.
150. This lettre de cachet is recorded in the Catalogue des manuscrits de la Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, ix (Arch. de la Bastille), p.236, no. 12477, but the document itself is missing from the collection; it was published by Delort, Détention des philosophes, p.78.
151. See Bastille 12484, f.44, 'écrou' dated 29 Mar. 1743, and cf. Delort, op.cit., pp.79-80, 'procès-verbal' relating to an examination of Lenglet's papers on 6 Apr.
152. See Bastille 11534, f.301; also Delort, op.cit., pp.78-9, and Ravaisson, Archives de la Bastille, xii, 237.

153. Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 59-60; cf. also letter from Bonardy to Bouhier, 12 Aug. 1743, where it is asserted 'Rollin doit avoir sa boutique fermée 3 mois pour avoir imprimé sans permission le Supplément aux Mémoires de Condé' (Nouv.acq.franç. 4300, f.58).
154. Secousse was not altogether correct in his predictions: it was only in 1745 that a new edition was brought out, probably in Holland, with additions by Prosper Marchand. Cf. Bibliography, 41.03.
155. Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 60.
156. Voltaire, Correspondence, ed. Besterman, D.2744.
157. Ibid., D.2802.
158. See his Dissertation de la mort de Henri IV which appeared for the first time in 1745 in a Dutch edition of the Oeuvres (Arkstée et Merkus, Amsterdam, vi, 320-8). It later became incorporated into editions of La Henriade: see La Henriade, ed. O.R. Taylor, p.338.
159. See Bastille 10880, f.262. Cf. Arch. de la Bastille, ed. Ravaisson, xii, 241, where this letter is published with a number of variants; see also Delort, Détention des philosophes, pp.80-3.
160. Delort, op.cit., p.80. The original of this letter was sold in two Charavay sales: cf. B.N., Dept. des ms., Fichier Charavay.
161. Bastille 12604; the sheet is dated 1745 in a hand other than Lenglet's, but it is far more probable that Lenglet drew up the list during his imprisonment in 1743.
162. Bastille 10880, f.262, letter dated 14 May 1743. The work referred to is probably the Tablettes chronologiques (cf. letter from Secousse, Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 66).
163. Bastille 10880, f.262, note added to Lenglet's letter.
164. See Bastille 12491, f.172, and Delort, Détention des philosophes, p.81 Note.
165. See Bastille 12581, 8 June 1743, and 10880, ff.254-6; cf. Delort, op.cit., p.83, and Ravaisson, op.cit., xii, 237.
166. See Bibliography, 42.01.
167. Nouv.acq.franç. 3344, f.53; cf. above p.308.
168. Pierre de l'Estoile, Journal des choses mémorables advenues durant tout le règne de Henri III, first edited by Pierre Dupuy, n.p., 1621, republished in an augmented edition by D. Godefroy and J. le Duchat in 1720, Cologne, 4 vols. in-8.
169. See letter Secousse to Bouhier, 5 Dec. 1741: 'Le Père Bouges, Augustin, qui nous a donné une nouvelle édition du Journal de Henry IV assez mal ordonnée et de laquelle je vous ai rendu compte, entreprend

d'en donner une du Journal de Henry III. Son dessein n'est pas cependant de faire réimprimer toutes les pièces qui sont dans l'édition de Godefroy. Il se bornera au texte qu'il accompagnera de notes et il y ajoutera des pièces, ou qui n'ont point encore paru, ou qui sont devenues rares. Il m'a fait l'honneur de me venir voir; et nous avons beaucoup raisonné sur son projet. Comme j'ai de l'expérience dans le métier d'éditeur, et que je puis même dire, parce que je n'en tirerai point de vanité, que j'ai quelque talent dans ce genre, j'espère que notre conversation ne sera pas inutile à la nouvelle édition du Journal de Henry III' (Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 45).

170. Many bibliographers, including Quérard (La France littéraire, v, 158) and Barbier (Les supercheries littéraires dévoilées, i, 667) have attributed the Journal de Henry IV to Lenglet, an error which resulted from the close relationship between the two editions; there are, however, in the Bibliothèque Nationale two volumes of manuscript notes on which the edition was based, which came from the monastery of the Grands-Augustins, and of which one is evidently rough notes in Bouges' own hand, the second a fair copy of the same. These material proofs substantiate the attribution to Bouges by contemporaries such as Secousse, who were well placed to have correct information on the subject (cf. letter 24 Mar. 1741, in Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 42-4).
171. See letter 10 Oct. 1742, Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 54.
172. Ibid.
173. Letter 28 June 1743, ibid., p.60.
174. Letter 6 Dec. 1743, ibid., p.66.
175. Guillaume François Joly de Fleury (1675-1756) had been responsible as Procureur Général for the organisation and classification of the Parlement archives; he retired in 1746, but kept an open 'cabinet' every afternoon for all who wished to consult him or ask his advice on legal or other matters. No doubt he was equally generous with his library: in his Preface Lenglet thanks him for the access he was given to the collection (cf. Biog.univers., xiv, 237-8).
176. Henri III, i, p.ix.
177. Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 66.
178. See ibid.
179. Henri III, i, p.vii.
180. Ibid.; see also notes to individual items in which Lenglet indicates their provenance.
181. See Bibliography, and the Catalogue des livres composant la bibliothèque de feu M. le Baron J. de Rothschild, Paris, 1884-1929, iii, 28-9.

182. Henri III, ii, 30 (cancellandum).
183. Comments on the massacres occur in many works, but Lenglet is evidently referring here to a remark in the bibliographical section of the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire, ed. 1729: citing a work by Pierre de la Ramée, Lenglet remarks that although a Catholic, he was killed on St. Bartholomew's Day, for 'il fut enveloppé par ses ennemis dans le massacre qui se fit des Huguenots dans cette infame journée, qui sera toujours le deshonneur de notre nation' (iv, 8, cancellandum). This is another example of Lenglet's refusal to accept the suppression of any of his ideas, which he persists in reintegrating into subsequent works.
184. Henri III, ii, 389-90 (cancellandum).
185. Ibid., i, 49-55.
186. Ibid., p.55.
187. Ed. C. Leber, J.-B. Salgues, and J. Cohen, Paris, Dentu, 1826-38, xviii, 19-25.
188. In Henri III, iii, 515-624 (first published 1589).
189. In ibid., i, 549-98 (first published in 1575).
190. See Michault, Mémoires, pp.182-3, where these two pieces are listed as separate publications; I have not located any copies, but J. d'Hébrail and J. de la Porte in La France littéraire (Paris, Duchesne, 1769, ii, 69) list the 'Tragédie de Gaspard de Coligny, nouvelle édition, 1744, in-8°'. Cf. also letter Secousse to Bouhier in which he comments on the extremely high price being paid for these two plays prior to Lenglet's edition (Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 75).
191. Letter 3 Sep. 1744, Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 75.
192. Vol. iii, 27.
193. Mémoires, p.181.
194. See Bibliography, 47.01.
195. Philippe de Comines, Seigneur d'Argenton (1445-1509) spent his youth at the court of Burgundy, where he was attached to the service of the future Charles the Bold. He showed himself from his youth to be a prudent and skilful negotiator; when Charles became intolerably unreasonable Comines, like many others at the court, went over to the side of Louis XI in 1472. The king showed his appreciation of Comines' abilities, and he soon became one of his most intimate associates. He lost much of his favour in 1488 after Louis' death, having been involved with the princes in conspiracies against the royal authority, but he was nonetheless involved in the negotiation of several major treaties for Charles VIII. He began writing his Mémoires in the 1490s and the first 6 books were published in Paris in 1523; the last two books were included in an edition published in Paris in 1528 (see Biog.univers., viii, 680-4).

196. Brussels, F. Foppens, 1723, 5 vols. in-8° (previously published with the same colophon, 1706-13). Re Godefroy cf. above Chapter II, p.54.
197. In Dec. 1745 the Journal des savants reports on Rollin's 'Programme pour donner avis au public, qu'il imprime actuellement une nouvelle Edition des Mémoires de Messire Philippe de Comines', naming Lenglet as the editor, and stating that the first 2 vols. are already printed (p.751).
198. Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 86.
199. Comines, i, p.lxxxvii.
200. He expresses his thanks to them in ibid., Preface, i, pp.lxxxvii-viii.
201. See B.N. (Hémicycle), 'Registres de prêt de la Bibliothèque du Roy', no. 4, 2 Oct. (cf. pp.339-41 below).
202. Charles Pineau Duclos (1704-72), novelist and historian, was the son of a hat manufacturer in Brittany, who was sent to study in Paris at an early age; he became a member of the Académie des Inscriptions in 1739, and of the Académie Française in 1747. He published two fairly successful novels in the early 1740 s, but the Histoire de Louis XI was his first scholarly work; he became 'historiographe de France' when Voltaire went to Prussia in 1750 (Biog.univers., xi, 404-6).
203. The abbé Joachim le Grand (1653-1733), who had developed an interest in history when he joined the Oratorians, started in 1697 to collect materials for a history of Louis XI, extending his researches to Burgundy and other provinces. He finished his 'Vie de Louis XI' some time after 1720, but never published it (Biog.univers., xxiii, 636).
204. The Comte de Maurepas (1701-81) was Secrétaire d'Etat, with responsibility for the administration of Paris and the Court (see Biog.univers., xxvii, 543-53).
205. Comines, i, p.lxxxix.
206. The 'le Grand' pieces make up a large proportion of the 'Preuves des Mémoires' in vols. II-IV, approx. 350 out of 424.
207. Comines, i, p.lxxxix.
208. See Biog.univers., xxxviii, pp.156-60.
209. See below, pp. 349-52.
210. Cf. above Chapter IV, p.190. De Saxe had been involved in an abortive attempt to land a fleet in England in favour of the Stuart pretender in the early 1740 s, which may also partly explain Lenglet's admiration for him.
211. Cf. Biog.univers., xxiv, 121, and Brunet, Manuel du libraire, ii, 191.

212. Some copies of the Dedication are in black only, some in black and red, which would suggest that the publisher intended them for different purposes, or that they were printed at different times from standing type (the most likely hypothesis): Rollin may have been forced to surrender his copies of the original printing.
213. Cf. Appendix below, pp.478 ff. Lenglet sent a separate copy of the Dedication to Cardinal Passionei in Rome (Letter 14 Oct. 1748, Piancastelli f.640).
214. Cf. Brunet, Manuel, ii, 191.
215. This is the number of portraits in the most complete copy I have found (Bibliothèque Mazarine, 17515 B-E). There are also 3 illustrations additional to the series, and 2 fold-out tables.
216. Mémoires de Trévoux, May 1747, pp.1139-40.
217. See copy Bibliothèque Mazarine, 17515 B-E (Vol. i, opposite p.xcvix).
218. Vol. v, under year 1755.
219. Journal des savants, June 1747, p.379.
220. See Brunet, Manuel, ii, 191. The original subscription price was 30 livres (the livre can be taken as roughly equivalent to the franc) in small paper, 40 livres in large paper (cf. Mémoires de de Trévoux, July 1746, pp.1542-3), but no doubt the Dedication and engravings were paid for separately.
221. Les Négotiations [et Oeuvres meslées] de M. le président Jeannin, ed. l'abbé Jeannis de Castille, Paris, Le Petit, 1656; Jeannin had died in 1622 aged 82 years. According to Quérard 'Ce recueil est regardé comme le meilleur modèle que puissent prendre les politiques et les négociateurs' (La France littéraire, iv, 221).
222. See quotation above p.308.
223. See above, p.311. The Chronologie novenaire was published in Paris by J. Richer, 3 vols. in-8°; it was not in fact re-edited until the end of the 18th century.
224. See Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 34.
225. See Supplément de la Méthode, 'Catalogue', p.163, where the item is listed as 'Chronologie Novennaire, ou Histoire de la guerre sous le Regne de Henri IV. depuis 1589 jusqu'en 1598 in-8°. Londres, 1741, 8. vol.'. .
226. Mémoires, p.210.
227. Amsterdam [Paris], 1758, 6 vols. in-4°.
228. La France littéraire, v, 160.
229. See below Chapter VI, pp.431-2, re the 'Inventaire après décès'.

230. Mémoires, pp.199-200.
231. See Bibliography, 39.01. The work appeared around Oct. 1743 (see Journal des savants, Oct. 1743, p.638), with the colophon 1744; some copies, however, have title-pages bearing the date 1742. There was obviously a considerable delay in the proposed date of publication because of Lenglet's imprisonment in 1743: no doubt this was the work for which the libraires were desperately trying to extract the Preface from the abbé.
232. A.M. Rousseau, L'Angleterre et Voltaire, (Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, cxlv-vii), 1976, iii, 826.
233. See, for example, his 'Introduction' to the Abrégé de l'histoire universelle, the Hague, Neaulme, 1753.
234. English, Italian and German: cf. Bibliography.
235. Cf. A.M. Rousseau, op.cit., iii, 826.
236. See Mémoires de Trévoux, Apr. 1763, p.960.
237. Jugements sur quelques ouvrages nouveaux, i(1744), 179.
238. The 'Table' gives the main chronological sequence, while the 'Tablettes' are devoted to specific subjects.
239. Lenglet refers to this suppression in his Lettre à l'auteur des Observations sur les écrit modernes (1739), p.19. The carton is probably that in vol. ii, 401-2.
240. Letter to Bouhier, 6 Dec. 1743, Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 66.
241. Nouv.acq.franç. 4384, f.231, letter Feb. 1744: 'Je n'ai pas assez de confiance en son exactitude, pour m'en rapporter à lui sur ces sortes de choses'.
242. Joseph Valart (1698-1781), having been educated through charity, opened a school in Amiens and published many elementary books for students. He subsequently moved to Paris, where his editions of Latin authors gave rise to many literary quarrels; A.A. Barbier accuses him of plagiarism in his grammatical works (cf. Biog.univers., xlii, 422-3).
243. See Tablettes, i, p.clxxv. Valart's Géographie abrégée was published in Paris by Robinot in 1743; on p.xviii, he attacked Lenglet's Méthode pour étudier la géographie which he described as 'le plus pitofable qu'on ait encore doné sur la géographie', showing, 'nulle justesse, nulle exactitude, nulle méthode'.
244. [Paris], 1744, in-8°, 24p.
245. Tablettes, i, p.clxxv.
246. Jugements, ii(1744), 283.

247. Ibid., p.285.
248. Lenglet was, however, given an opportunity to take his revenge by publishing an article in the following issue of the Jugements, (iii, 110-14), entitled 'Lettre d'un Professeur de ***, à l'Auteur des Jugemens, etc. sur la Grammaire de M. Vallart', and which was, of course, highly critical of Valart's Grammaire française (Paris, Desaint et Saillant, 1744). This is undoubtedly one of many anonymous articles which Lenglet contributed to the journals, but which are normally difficult to identify.
249. August 1744, pp.1533-5: it is not surprising that the Jesuits should be sympathetic to Valart in view of Lenglet's criticism of Catrou and Rouillé, two prominent members of the society. Other articles specifically on Lenglet's Tablettes appeared in the Mémoires de Trévoux, Dec. 1743, pp.3047-50; ibid., Apr. 1763, pp.957-70; Jugements sur quelques ouvrages nouveaux, i, 169-84. There were brief notices on the edition in the Journal des savants, 1741, p.128, and 1743, p.638, and in La Bibliothèque française, xxxviii, 178.
250. Mémoires, p.131.
251. L. Mayeul-Chaudon, Bibliothèque d'un homme de goût, ou avis sur le choix des meilleurs livres écrits en notre langue sur tous les genres de science et de littérature, Avignon, Joseph Blery, 1772, i, 1.
252. See, for example, the Questions sur l'Encyclopédie, n.p., 1770-1, iii, 346-7.
253. Letter to Georg Conrad Walther, from Potsdam, 6 Mar. 1752: 'Si vous avez l'histoire chronologique de l'abbé Lenglet du Frenoi, en deux tomes, vous me ferez plaisir de me l'envoyer sans délais. J'en ai un besoin pressant' (Voltaire, Correspondence, ed. Besterman, D.4826).
254. Ibid., D.2802.
255. Michault tells us that the new edition was under the direction of the abbé Jean-Baptiste le Mascrier, another prolific polygraph and a close contemporary of Lenglet's, up to his death in 1760, whereupon the work was completed by a 'sçavant Bénédictin' (Mémoires, p.131).
256. Passionei had been given the Cardinal's hat in 1739; he was a close friend of Prosper Lambertini, who became Pope in 1740 with the name of Benedict XIV.
257. See above, Chapter II, p.72.
258. See 'Epître à son Eminence Monsiegnur le Cardinal Passionei', Tablettes, vol. i, and Chapter II above, p.84.
259. Re Passionei and his correspondents see Gossman, Medievalism and the ideologies of the Enlightenment, pp.81-5.
260. See ibid., p.81.

261. Lenglet's letters to Passionei are conserved in two Italian libraries: the Biblioteca Comunale of Forli, Collezione Piancastelli, 12 letters (classified under letter 'D'), dated 1745-50; and the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, 29 letters, dated 1754-5, in Vat.Lat.9813; 1 letter, dated 1714, in Vat.Lat.9810; 1 letter, dated 1714, in Vat.Lat.9815.
262. Cf. Chapter II, p.85.
263. See, for e.g., letter 15 Sep. 1749 (Piancastelli, ff.664-5), and letter 30 Oct. 1754 (Vat.Lat.9813, f.47). None of the letters from Passionei to Lenglet would appear to have survived.
264. Cf. letter 5 July 1745 (Piancastelli, f.613): 'Dés que j'aurai quelque occasion certaine j'ai, Monseigneur, à vous envoyer ceux de mes ouvrages que vous n'avez pas: et Votre Eminence jugera du nombre de mes années par le nombre des volumes que j'ai publiez, car l'un est égal à l'autre'.
265. Cf. below, Chapter VI, pp.427ff.
266. See letter 28 Apr. 1749 (Piancastelli, f.644): Lenglet negotiated a very favourable rate for the Cardinal for those copies which he would wish to take for himself: De Bure would take only 10% on top of the cost price 'pour ses peines et soins', whereas, Lenglet suggests, he would normally get in the region of 100% of the cost price on a sale; 'C'est tout ce qu'on peut obtenir de plus favorable', Lenglet assures the Cardinal. But the bargain was never concluded: De Bure appears to have backed down (cf. ibid., f.664 and f.715), and the Acta were never published after 1738.
267. Cf. below Chapter VI, pp.395 ff.
268. Cf. above Chapter I, p.6, on the use of this name.
269. In letter 12 July 1745 (recorded in Fichier Charavay, B.N., Dept. des mss.) Lenglet asks Passionei to solicit for him the benefice of the late M. Guayande, Docteur de Sorbonne; on 11 Aug. 1749 Lenglet asks Passionei to recommend him to the Papal Nuncio, who could speak on his behalf to the Evêque de Mirepoix 'qui est ici le distributeur absolu des grâces Ecclesiastiques' (Piancastelli, f.653).
270. On 15 Sep. 1749 Lenglet thanks Passionei for the recommendation he has sent to the Nuncio, who has promised to act on it (Piancastelli, ff.665-6).
271. See, for e.g., letter 15 Sep. 1749 in which he thanks Passionei for 'les mss. de Rome du livre De Imitatione Christi' (Piancastelli, f.664) and letters 30 June and 2 Sep. 1748 (Ibid., ff.624 and 636) re the edition of Lactantius.
272. See letter 28 Apr. 1749 (Piancastelli, f.645), and 15 Sep. following, where Lenglet acknowledges a letter from the Pope permitting the publication (f.663).

273. See letter 5 July 1745, Piancastelli, f.611; cf. also letter 28 Apr. 1749 (f.643) when he sends a copy of Lactantii opera.
274. Letter 5 July 1745, Piancastelli, f.611. The edition was never actually published: see below p.336.
275. Lucius-Caelius-Firmianus Lactantius (died c. 325) showed great talents in eloquence and erudition as a young man. He renounced paganism some time before 303A.D. and the persecutions of Diocletian. From then on he devoted his talents to works of Christian apologetics; his chief work was the Divinarum institutionum in 7 books. He modelled his style on that of Cicero, and is known as the most eloquent and polished of the Latin Fathers (Biog.univers., xxii, 416-8).
276. Lebrun (1651-1731), the son of a bookseller from Rouen who had been condemned to the galleys for publishing books in favour of Port-Royal, had received part of his education at the abbey, and always retained his attachment to his old masters. His Jansenist sympathies led to his own imprisonment in the Bastille in 1707, where he spent 5 years. It was around this time that he started work on the edition of Lactantius which he had not completed at his death. He did, however, publish several works and editions related to the history of the church (Biog.univers., xxiii, 502-3).
277. See Lactantii opera omnia, 'Praefatio', i, p.iii.
278. See Piancastelli, ff.624-5, letter 30 June 1748: Lenglet asks Passionei to try to find out the dates of 12 mss. in the Vatican library mentioned by an earlier German editor of the work, and to give him the contemporary shelf-marks of these and any further mss.. He also asks the Cardinal to approach the Dominicans in Rome for some details on the life of a Père Brasichelli, whose notes he has found in a ms. in the Bibliothèque du Roi, adding the comment: 'C'est à la vérité une remarque peu intéressante; mais des Lecteurs studieux sont ravis de trouver ces petites particularités, qui souvent font plus d'honneur qu'elles ne valent. Mais elles témoignent toujours le soin qu'on a pris de l'instruire'. Passionei sent at least part of the information requested to Lenglet on 7 Aug., for which the abbé thanked him in a letter of 2 Sep. 1748 (Piancastelli, f.636).
279. The agreement is recorded in the Fichier Charavay, B.N., Dept. des mss., having been sold at a Charavay sale: 'Cession faite à Jean de Bure de l'édition entière des oeuvres de Lactance, commencée et laissée imparfaite par Lebrun des Marets [...] 5 Sep. 1746'.
280. Piancastelli, f.619.
281. In Oct. 1748 Lenglet writes of 'mon Edition de Lactance qui finit ce mois-cy' (Piancastelli, f.640); Lenglet sent two copies, probably bound, to Rome in Mar. 1749 (f.643), presumably therefore it was actually published around the end of the year 1748.
282. Letter 28 July 1749, Piancastelli, f.647.
283. Cf. Michault, Mémoires, p.186: 'Elle a du moins cet avantage, qu'on

ne trouve dans le texte presque aucunes fautes d'impression'. There is at the back of vol. ii an 'Avis au Relieur pour placer les cartons', involving 16 pages to be excised and replaced. It seems unlikely that these involved changes due to censorship; they were probably printed to replace sheets containing printing errors.

284. See, for e.g., the Mémoires de Trévoux, May 1749, pp. 773 ff.: 'On s'en tiendra à cette dernière Edition, parce qu'elle a tous les avantages des précédentes, et qu'elle présente de nouvelles perfections, sans compter après tout qu'il seroit difficile de rien donner qui satisfît mieux l'oeil et le goût des Connoisseurs'; the Journal des savants (1749, pp. 131-6) is equally approbatory. Cf. also 'Notices' in Trévoux, Sep. 1747, pp. 1909-10, and June 1748, p. 1335; La Bibliothèque annuelle, i, 11.
285. An interesting Mémoire written in 1777 gives details of De Bure's stock and sales from date of printing, including a number of Lenglet's works and editions: see Marie-Anne Merland, 'Tirage et vente de livres à la fin du XVIIIe siècle: des documents chiffrés', Revue française d'histoire du livre, 1973, pp. 3-28.
286. Ibid., p. 14.
287. See above Chapters I, p. 31, and IV, pp. 180-1, on his two French editions of the work.
288. Piancastelli, ff. 611-12.
289. Piancastelli, ff. 639-40.
290. Piancastelli, f. 649; Lenglet thanks the Cardinal 'pour les mss. de Rome du livre De Imitatione Christi' in a letter of 15 Sep. 1749 (f. 664). In a letter of 29 May 1754 to a correspondent in Orléans Lenglet describes the manuscript sources which he had used in the preparation of his editions: 'J'ai fait conférer un ms. de la Bibl. Vaticane; c'est l'unique qui s'y trouve et qui vient de la Reine de Suede. J'en ai conféré deux de la Bibliothèque du Roi. J'en ai actuellement 4 ou 5 de l'abb. de S. Germain qui viennent d'Italie et qui sont plus anciens que Thomas a Kempis' (in Jeanne d'Arc Collection, Butler Library, Columbia University). He also used the earliest editions, with the exception of the second, basing his text largely on that of 1554, a rare edition of which he had donated his own copy to the Bibliothèque du Roi (Vat. Lat. 9813, f. 39).
291. He had gone to considerable pains in his researches, as he told the Cardinal: 'J'ai cherché et fait chercher en Allemagne pour voir si dans les Mss. Latins je ne découvrois pas ce chapitre' (Piancastelli, f. 716).
292. Vat. Lat. 9813, f. 38.
293. Letter 29 May 1754, in Jeanne d'Arc Collection, Butler Library. Valart published his edition in duodecimo, De Imitatione Christi libri quatuor, ad octo manuscriptorum ac primarum editonum fidem castigati et mendis plus secentis expurgati, in Paris in 1758.

294. The last reference to it in the Passionei correspondence occurs in a letter of 30 Oct. 1754, Vat.Lat.9813, f.48.
295. See Bibliography, 40.01.
296. See above Chapter IV, pp.191-3.
297. See Déon de Beaumont, L'Année littéraire, iii(1755), 128, and Michault, Mémoires, pp.176-7.
298. See L'Année littéraire, vii(1755), 139-42.
299. Déon de Beaumont, op.cit., p.128, and Michault, Mémoires, p.177.
300. Cf. above Chapter IV, pp.20-1.
301. Cf. Michault, Mémoires, p.177; one such copy is conserved in the Bibliothèque Nationale (cf. Bibliography).
302. See Bibliography, 46.01.
303. See Barbier, Les supercheries littéraires dévoilées, iv, 91, and Brunet, Manuel du libraire, iv, 1157.
304. Recueil de romans, i, p.i.
305. Ibid., p.ii.
306. See 'Avertissement', vol. v, and 'Préface', vol. vi.
307. See 'Préface', vol. vi: 'Il faut donner de garde de ... laisser avilir [cette sage passion]'.
308. See above Chapter IV, pp.218-19.
309. Recueil de romans, i, p.viii.
310. See above Chapter III, pp.122-3: it was in fact the same Jean-Paul Bignon who was now head conservator of the Bibliothèque du Roi, a post which he held up to his death in 1743.
311. B.N., Hémicycle, 'Registres de prêt', 8 vols. ms.
312. 'Registres', vols. ii and iii.
313. Ibid., vols. iv and v.
314. Ibid., vols. v and vi.
315. Ibid., vol. vii. Cf. below, Chapter VI, pp. 399-400.
316. See, for example, the terms of the Preface to the Journal de Henri III: 'On verra que j'ai profité du trésor immense, que renferme la Bibliothèque de sa Majesté; je dois à la politesse de M. Bignon, et à l'amour pour les lettres, qui a toujours distingué M. l'abbé Sallier,

la communication qu'ils ont eu la permission de m'en faire' (i, p.vii); and that of the Comines edition: 'M. l'abbé Bignon Bibliothécaire, et M. l'abbé Sallier sous-bibliothécaire du Roi, dont on ne saurait assez louer l'amour pour le progrès des lettres, m'ont fait la grace de me communiquer ce que la Bibliothèque de sa Majesté, a de plus précieux sur les règnes de Louis XI et de Charles VIII' (i, p.lxxxviii). The abbé Claude Sallier (1685-1761) had been a member of the Académie des Inscriptions since 1715, where he had read innumerable 'Mémoires', and of the Académie Française since 1729; he had been given the Chair in Hebrew at the Collège Royal in 1719, and took up his place at the Bibliothèque du Roi in 1721. He enjoyed the enormous correspondence with literary men throughout Europe which this charge generated (see Biog.univers., xxxvii, 518).

317. Paris, Imprimerie Royale, 1717-1809, xxxi, 307-14.
318. Vat.Lat.9813, f.47, letter 7 Oct. 1754; also ibid., f.39, letter 26 Aug. 1754.
319. Bignon gave the approbation for Lenglet's Traité de la confession as far back as 1708, and Sallier for the Tablettes chronologiques, Lactantii opera, Monarchie française, Jeanne d'Arc, and the two Calendriers.
320. Letter 22 July 1754, Vat.Lat.9813, f.30. Lenglet sent a number of such manuscript 'Mémoires' to the Garde des Sceaux, de Machault, c. 1750, 'dont trois regardoient les affaires du clergé' (Delort, Détention des philosophes, p.101).
321. Piancastelli, f.625 (letter 30 June 1748).
322. Piancastelli, f.717 (letter 27 Apr. 1750).
323. Cf. Chapter IV above, Note 262.
324. See Alfred Cobban, A History of modern France, 1963, i, 72.
325. Re the diplomatic history of this period see Gaston Zeller, Les Temps modernes, (Histoire des relations internationales, vol. iii), ii, 198-221.
326. See study of Du Bos as a 'publiciste' in Alfred Lombard, L'Abbé Du Bos, un initiateur de la pensée moderne (1670-1742); pp.102 ff.
327. See Bibliography, 43.01.
328. There were several re-editions of the work in the same year.
329. Vol. ii(1744), p.287.
330. London, John Nourse, 1743, 2 vols.
331. That the work was nonetheless published in France is clear from a letter from Secousse to Bouhier, where the former states that the Lettres de Van-Hoey have been republished 'furtivement' in Paris,

adding 'et on y a joint les lettres d'un prétendu Hollandais', clearly referring to Lenglet's work (see Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 75).

332. Lettres, négociations et pièces secrètes, pp.i-iii.
333. Ibid., 'Avertissement'.
334. Ibid., pp.1-67.
335. Ibid., pp.1-17. Maria-Theresa had been thwarted in her design of having her husband elected as Roman Emperor by the Franco-Prussian initiatives (see Zeller op.cit., pp.206-7).
336. Cf. Chapter IV above, pp.169-70, and 178-9, re Lenglet's relations with Santa-Cruz.
337. Lettres..., pp.18-42.
338. Ibid., pp.43-67.
339. Ibid., pp.259-70.
340. Jugements sur quelques ouvrages nouveaux, ii(1744), p.288.
341. See Correspondance de Bouhier, i, 75-6 (letter 3 Sep. 1744), but the editor's Note 1 on p.76 is misleading: the work to which our quotation refers, i.e. 'les lettres d'un prétendu Hollandais', is undoubtedly Lenglet's Lettres, négociations et pièces secrètes; the 'nouveau volume' is most likely the Europe pacifiée published in the following year. Secousse's remark here may indicate a degree of collusion between Lenglet and the administration, since he felt obliged to hide the identity of the author.
342. See Bibliography, 44.01.
343. L'Europe pacifiée, pp. 1-35.
344. Ibid., p.11.
345. Ibid., pp.49-174.
346. Ibid., p.57.
347. L'Année littéraire, iii(1735), 129.
348. L'Europe pacifiée, pp.175-80.
349. Frederick-Henon, Count Seckendorff (1673-1763) was a skilful negotiator and general in the imperial army. When Charles VII died in 1744, Seckendorff advised the young elector of Bavaria, his successor, to make peace with the court of Vienna, for which he incurred the wrath of Frederick II of Prussia and of the French. Lenglet's accusations that he had betrayed Charles VII seem to be without foundation (see Biog.univers., xxviii, pp.622-7).

350. 'Mémoire' presented to Malesherbes to justify Lenglet's request for a reward for past services rendered to the crown, *Nouv.acq.franç.* 3344, f.52. Marc-Pierre de Voyer, Comte d'Argenson, who became *Ministre de la Guerre* in 1743, had also been *Directeur de la Librairie* since 1737, and as such had had dealings with Lenglet,
351. Lettres d'un pair, p.10, Note 1. Michault reports this incident, adding that 'l'événement justifia tout ce qu'il en avoit dit' (Mémoires, pp.35-6).
352. See Bibliography, 45.01.
353. Lettres d'un pair, p.42.
354. Ibid., p.78.
355. D'Argenson, in fact, wished to support Augustus III, king of Poland, whom Frederick saw as one of his chief opponents: both of these candidates, for different reasons, secretly began negotiations with Maria-Theresa to give their votes to her husband Francis of Lorraine, who was duly elected Emperor (cf. Zeller, op.cit., pp.213-15).
356. See Lettres d'un pair, pp.73-4. It is extremely unlikely that Chauvelin received any English bribes for the treaty with Spain in 1729, since his policies were resolutely pro-Spanish, against Austria and England; it was Cardinal Fleury who brought England into the treaty negotiations contrary to Chauvelin's intentions (see Zeller, op.cit., p.182).
357. Gros de Boze, censor of Lenglet's Méthode pour étudier l'histoire in 1729, had temporarily replaced Maboul as *Inspecteur de la librairie*.
358. Voltaire, Correspondence, ed. Besterman, D.3198, letter 19 Aug. 1745.
359. Zeller, op.cit., p.182.
360. July 1745, pp.1317-9.
361. Déon de Beaumont, L'Année littéraire, iii(1755), 129.
362. See Bibliography, 49.01.
363. The ^{P S}Bacha was governor of Rhodes and the surrounding islands; see Relation, p.2.
364. Ibid., p.14.
365. This copy letter (dated 8 Nov. 1749) is bound with a copy of the pamphlet in the Biblioteca Angelica in Rome (C 628XXXV), where part of Passionei's library is conserved.
366. Berryer was Lieutenant de Police from 1747-53: Michaud asserts that in that position he encouraged 'la délation et l'espionnage' (Biog.univers., iv, 115-16), which policy may account for his relationship with Lenglet. The abbé describes Berryer as an old friend on several occasions; see for example letter to Passionei, 27 Apr. 1750 (Piancastelli, f.717): 'J'ai remis a M. Berryer, mon ancien ami et Lieutenant general de Police, mon ms. des apparitions ...'.

367. Cf. letter 27 Apr. 1750, Coll.Pian., ff.716-17: 'J'ai pris la liberté de donner ou plutot de faire envoyer une lettre de recommandation a V.E. pour un Chanoine de Malte nommé M. Agius, qui est ici protégé par un Bailli de Malte de mes amis'.
368. See Bibliography, 50.01. The Mémoires de la Régence were first published in the Hague, J.Van Duren, 1729, with further editions in 1736, 1737 and 1742.
369. See Régence, v, 169-209.
370. Ibid., pp.210-73.
371. Ibid., p.207.
372. Ibid., p.209.
373. Ibid., pp.208-9.
374. Histoire d'un voyage littéraire, p.117.
375. Nouv.acq.franç. 10782, f.101.
376. See Charles Barthélemy, 'Deux lettres inédites de l'abbé Lenglet du Fresnoy et de Gresset', Bulletin de la Société des antiquaires de Picardie, iv(1850-2), 149-50; and cf. the Fichier Charavay in the B.N., Dept. des ms., where this letter is dated 14 Oct. 1748.
377. Cf. Bibliography.
378. The remark occurs in the Supplément de la Méthode pour étudier l'histoire, Part 2, p.168.
379. Mémoires, p.187.
380. Ibid. A review in the Bibliothèque raisonnée des ouvrages des savants of the first edition in 1729 did not share Michault's view: the Mémoires de la Régence is described as a 'froide et insipide compilation des Gazètes, Mercuries, et autres Journaux du tems' (vol. ii, 56-65).
381. See 'Avis de l'imprimeur', Régence, vol. i.
382. Compare, for example, Piossens' Preface in the two editions: the whole tone, severely anti-Jesuit, and plainly sympathetic to the Jansenists, has been softened by Lenglet. Since we know that the abbé himself was no lover of the Society of Jesus it is evident that his purpose in modifying the text was to secure its distribution, if not its publication in France.
383. Not all the 'Pièces', however, were added by Lenglet: some had been published by Piossens, but were incorporated into his text.
384. Régence, ii, 217-30.

385. See above Chapter IV, p.196.
386. Régence, ii, 231-88.
387. Two copies of the 'Mémoire des formalités nécessaires pour valider la renonciation du Roi d'Espagne' are listed by Renée Simon, A la recherche d'un homme et d'un auteur, p.13; one in the Ecole supérieure de la guerre, and one in the library of Angoulême.
388. Bibliothèque historique de la France, Paris, Herissant, 1768-78, i, no. 24574.

CHAPTER VI

1750-1755Last challenges to authority

The decade of the 1750's opened on a somewhat inauspicious note for Lenglet with a new period of imprisonment. But though he was now seventy-six years old these last years of his life were also to prove highly prolific. His first irregular venture was the publication of two almanacs: a Calendrier historique pour l'année M.DCC.L. avec l'origine de toutes les maisons souveraines, tirée du Nouvel abrégé chronologique de l'histoire de l'Europe, published by Leloup,¹ and a somewhat similar Calendrier des princes et de la noblesse pour l'année 1750, which appeared 'chez Delaguette'.² The first-named of these works was, as the title indicates, offered as an extract from a larger work to follow, 'pour pressentir le goût du Public'.³ Of the proposed Nouvel abrégé chronologique de l'histoire de l'Europe the 'Avis du libraire' asserts:

Je commence à imprimer la France; ensuite je donnerai l'Italie, puis l'Allemagne; et ainsi des autres Monarchies, chacune desquelles fera deux volumes ;

and at the back of the volume we find no less than two approbations by the abbé Sallier for sections of such a work which had been presented to him in manuscript. Yet no part of this work, other than the 'Extrait' here included, was later published, and there is reason to doubt that Lenglet ever had any serious intentions in that regard;⁴ the aim in publishing the two almanacs was primarily one of political propaganda in favour of the Stuart pretender, and the Nouvel abrégé may

never have been anything more than a stratagem to procure an approbation as would afterwards be claimed by the authorities.

The privilège for the Nouvel abrégé was in fact procured in the name of a 'Sieur Gosford'; one might easily suppose that this was just one more of Lenglet's pseudonyms, but documents from the Archives de la Bastille indicate that such a person did exist, and was involved in the publication, if not the writing of the Calendriers.⁵ The Inspecteur de la librairie, d'Hémerly, wrote of him:

Ce Gosford [...] était un Ecossais qui avait quitté son pays pour cause de religion et qui était passé en Espagne où il avait appris la langue du pays, ce qui l'a mis à même de traduire la 'Métallurgie' d'Alphonse Barba,⁶

a work which Lenglet was also involved in publishing around this period.

A third accomplice in the affair, whose exact role is not clear, was a 'Dom Jean Cruise, vulgo de la Croix, Irlandois cy devant Cordellier, prêtre profès de l'abbaye de Charoux, au diocèse de Poitiers'.⁷ The origins of Lenglet's two associates easily explain their attachment to the cause of the Catholic pretender to the throne of Great Britain, who claimed the title of James III, and whose court at Saint-Germain-en-Laye had formerly attracted innumerable exiles from Ireland and Scotland, his co-religionists, for whom France had always been the favourite refuge.⁸ The abbé, as we have seen, had long before expressed his sympathies with the Stuart cause;⁹ that he associated with the Jacobite circles in Paris is also clear from a letter to Passionei, where he speaks of 'les accès que j'ai auprès d'un confident du Roi Jacques d'Angleterre'.¹⁰ It was no doubt within these circles that the little plot was hatched.

The two works were slightly different in form and content; the

Calendrier historique contained the calendar itself, giving the birth-days of the European nobility, and was followed by the 'Extrait de l'abrégé...', of which the first ten pages were devoted to a chronology of the French royal families. It was in the following section on the 'Origine des Maisons des Princes et Souverains étrangers' that the contentious material was to be found: two royal families were listed for England, Brunswick and Stuart. Under the entry for Brunswick the author wrote:

La Branche d'Hannovre possède le Royaume de la Grande Bretagne depuis l'an 1714 qu'elle y fut appelée par la mort de la Reine Anne, quoiqu'il y ait au moins une trentaine de prétendants avant cette maison, surtout les 3 princes de la Maison de Stuart: mais la Maison d'Hannovre possède actuellement cette couronne et les autres ne font que former des prétentions, qui toutes justes qu'elles sont, restent sans aucun effet;

and correspondingly the entry for Stuart read:

Maison souveraine, à qui de droit appartient le Royaume de la Grande Bretagne, quoique possédé actuellement par le Duc de Brunswic Hanovre [...] Cette Maison depuis 150 ans se trouve accablée de toutes les infortunes qui peuvent tomber sur les Souverains. Mais elle a dans Charles Edouard Prince de Galles un Héros qui par sa valeur et par une prudence prématurée mérite de regner sur la Nation Britannique, et la Nation ne sera vraiment heureuse et tranquille, que quand elle rendra justice à cette Maison.

The Calendrier des princes contained a straightforward calendar, a chronological list of the kings of France, and an alphabetical list of the great houses of the kingdom, which also included the 'Maisons Souveraines quoiqu'étrangères dont il n'est guères permis d'ignorer l'origine et la filiation':¹¹ the house of Stuart was, of course, the foremost of these. The author's comment was briefer, but in the same vein as that in the former work.¹² The remarks made by the lawyer Edmond-Jean-François Barbier, writing about the Calendrier historique in his diary in January 1750, provide an interesting gauge of the climate of opinion, and indicate the degree to which the administration's policies in relation to the hereditary enemy are clearly perceived by

the educated public:

L'abbé Lenglet ne s'est pas contenté de rappeler la très-grande ancienneté de cette maison; il dit que le royaume d'Angleterre appartient à cette maison de droit, et qu'il a été usurpé par les princes de la maison de Brunswick-Hanovre, qui étoient le père du Roi régnant actuellement. Il dit encore que le prince Edouard a donné des preuves d'une grande bravoure et d'une grande fermeté, et qu'il a toutes les qualités requises pour faire un grand Roi. Tout ceci est connu de tout le monde; mais il ajoute ensuite, par réflexion de lui-même, que les Anglais ne seront jamais heureux et tranquilles qu'ils n'aient remis sur le trône leurs véritables et légitimes souverains. Or, cette réflexion, et cette espèce de conseil qu'il donne aux Anglois, est vive et trop hasardée, surtout le lendemain, pour ainsi dire, d'un traité de paix avec l'Angleterre. ¹³

It was this latter aspect of Lenglet's text, Barbier suggests, which provoked an official complaint from the British ambassador in France, ¹⁴ and a speedy response from the French government who were highly embarrassed in view of the fact that the almanacs carried the stamp of approval of Lenglet's longtime acquaintance, the abbé Sallier of the Bibliothèque du Roi. ¹⁵ On 3rd January the Conseil d'Etat du Roi ordered the suppression of the two calendars, and published an Arrêt to the effect that the author and publishers of the Calendrier historique had illegally evaded the censorship laws by using a privilege issued for the Nouvel abrégé chronologique de l'Histoire de France (sic.):

Sa Majesté aurait appris, que quoiqu'il n'en ait été encore imprimé aucuns, on aurait entrepris sur une approbation surprise par l'abus qu'on a fait dudit privilège, d'en faire imprimer sans privilège ni permission, et débiter chez Leloup Libraire, des extraits prétendus tirés dudit Abrégé [...] dans lequel l'Auteur de cet ouvrage parle de Maisons souveraines alliées de la France, avec une témérité qui mérite d'autant plus d'être réprimée, que le titre d'un pareil ouvrage a empêché que l'on n'y donnât la même attention que l'on aurait apportée à l'examen du livre annoncé par le privilège, où l'on n'aurait jamais laissé passer des traits si répréhensibles. ¹⁶

The Calendrier des princes, 'où l'on trouve une partie de ce qu'il y a de punissable dans le premier, et exprimée dans les mêmes termes', was condemned on the same grounds. The distribution and sale of the work was to be immediately stopped, and all recoverable copies to be 'mis

au pilon'. This Arrêt was soon followed, on 7th January, by a lettre de cachet for the arrest of Lenglet and Leloup, the publisher; they were immediately apprehended and taken first to the prison of Fort l'Evêque, then transferred the following day to the Bastille.¹⁷ Leloup, who, after all, could scarcely be held responsible for the offence when there had been an approbation given for the work, was released a week or so later;¹⁸ Lenglet's stay was a longer one. An order was issued against the elusive Gosford, exiling him from the kingdom, but apparently this order 'n'a pu être exécuté parce qu'on n'a pu découvrir sa demeure';¹⁹ Dom Cruise was sent back to his abbey in Poitiers by an order of 23rd January.²⁰

We have little information about Lenglet's term of imprisonment, other than that someone tried to get letters to him by the well-worn technique of hiding them in books.²¹ His faithful sister, Marguerite de la Barre, did her best to procure his release;²² it was probably her efforts which won the support of the Comte d'Argenson who intervened on Lenglet's behalf.²³ His captivity lasted two and a half months, the order for his release being finally issued on 24th March 1750.²⁴ As for the two Calendriers, we must assume that some copies were seized by the police, but the authorities may not have been over-assiduous in their searches once the British had been appeased by the two arrests: a certain number were certainly in public circulation. One anonymous author even took the trouble to publish an 8-page critique of the Calendrier historique,²⁵ much in the style of the abbé Valart's Lettre critique on the subject of the Tablettes chronologiques, attacking Lenglet, who is named, for a number of errors and inaccuracies.

It might have been hoped by the administration, and by Lenglet's family, that this would be his last trip to the Bastille, and that his advanced age might dampen his appetite for political involvement, and encourage a prudent retirement. But such was not the nature of the man. We have already encountered his habit of committing to writing his analyses and opinions on current political affairs;²⁶ despite his insistence that these were largely for his own benefit, or occasionally a response to the solicitation of friends, in fact it was his practice to send such letters and 'Mémoires' to persons in positions of power, including the ministers of state, on all sorts of matters of varying importance.²⁷ Some, as we have seen, contained projects for improving the state finances or public services. Of a different nature were a series of letters which he apparently sent to M. de Machault, Contrôleur des Finances and Garde des Sceaux, some time prior to 1750; some of these concerned the 'affaires de clergé', and were signed by Lenglet: to these he received a reply from the minister, 'dans laquelle je remarquai', he later declares, 'une douceur de mœurs, et une politesse que je n'avois encore trouvée en aucun ministre'.²⁸ Machault d'Arnouville was a former Intendant who was called to the ministry to replace Philibert Orry, that Contrôleur whom Lenglet had lampooned in his Histoire de la philosophie hermétique; the latter's downfall was brought about in 1745 by the Pâris brothers and their protégée, Mme de Pompadour, who had now become the king's mistress. Described as a 'cold, taciturn, rigid, honest administrator' the new Contrôleur tried to reform the fiscal system, introducing in 1749 the vingtième, a tax of one-twentieth to be levied on all incomes, including those of the clergy.²⁹ The latter group, along with the nobility, mounted a strong opposition to the imposition of the levy; they were supported

by the dévot party at court, and by the Comte d'Argenson, Ministre de la guerre, with whom Lenglet had recently renewed contacts,³⁰ and who was a personal enemy of de Machault. It was very probably in relation to this situation that Lenglet had addressed his 'Mémoires' to the minister, and possibly also at the instigation of these opponents of de Machault that he sent anonymous letters of attack to the Garde des Sceaux. The second of these letters has been preserved;³¹ it is extremely lengthy and consists of a vicious onslaught on the minister's character and administration. It concentrates largely on relatively petty details of the financial administration which Lenglet construes to be proof of de Machault's inadequacy and unreliability. The tone is highly impertinent, as witnessed by the opening statement:

Ce n'est ni par mauvaise humeur, ni par animosité que je vous écris; mais comme bon citoyen et comme fidèle sujet du Roy, dont je desire le bien autant et plus que vous même, et auquel, soit dit sans vous déplaire, j'ai rendu plus de service que jamais vous ne ferés;³²

but despite such protestations, and his repeated expressions of concern for 'le peuple' which is oppressed by taxes, the main impetus behind the piece is that of personal or sectional grievance. In criticising an increase in the capitation tax, for example, the writer remarks:

On vous a présenté des moyens très utiles [de trouver les fonds nécessaires], aux quels vous n'avés pas même daigné prêter attention;³³

and to illustrate the minister's 'détestable caractère' he quotes two incidents where acquaintances of his were promised favours by de Machault which they never received.³⁴ Again one must surmise, as with the Orry affair, that Lenglet's attack was motivated, in part at least, by his personal sense of rejection, the administrators having failed to adopt those projects and plans which he submitted to them, and in

the value of which he himself had such belief.

The terms of the attack were so vituperative and personal that the unfortunate recipient could scarcely ignore it. Moreover, he had been warned in the final paragraph that the author did not intend these comments for his eyes alone:

Et comme ce que je dis peut être de conséquence pour l'état, je prends la liberté de faire passer jusques au Roi une copie de ce que je vous écris aujourd'hui.³⁵

De Machault therefore sent the letter to the Lieutenant général de police for investigation around the end of August 1751, first removing one particularly embarrassing paragraph where Lenglet accused him of being a 'mauvais maître' who was hated by his own household.³⁶ D'Hémery, a police officer who had had previous dealings with the abbé, recognised the hand-writing, and quickly revealed the true identity of the 'Chevalier de Lussan' who had signed the letter.³⁷ Two experts in calligraphy confirmed his attribution,³⁸ and an order for Lenglet's arrest was issued on 25th December 1751: he was apprehended 4 days later.³⁹ The abbé was now 77 years old, and had survived at least seven terms of captivity. D'Hémery recounts that when he went to arrest him:

il a d'abord été surpris de nous voir, et a enfin (à son ordinaire), soutenu cela avec assez de fermeté.⁴⁰

Nor did he at first understand why he was being arrested: possibly he had an uneasy conscience on a number of heads, for he immediately suspected the bookseller Rollin, 'avec qui il est en dispute', of having done him this bad turn.⁴¹ He quickly confessed his guilt however, and three days after his arrest wrote a letter to de Machault, as abject as the previous one had been arrogant, imploring mercy, and

assuring the minister that his judgement of him had completely changed since the time when he wrote the offending letter. He pleads his financial difficulties: he is in debt to the tune of 3,500 livres, for although he has worked in the literary field for 56 years, it has won him no official recognition in the form of a pension or position. To discharge his debts therefore he had recently acquired a privilège for his 'principaux ouvrages', but if he cannot soon make use of it, he will be ruined.⁴² M. de Machault was not, however, willing to forgive and forget quite so promptly; Lenglet accordingly decided to make the best of his situation, and look elsewhere for clemency and support. He asked Berryer, the Lieutenant général de police with whom he had long been acquainted, to accord him some 'adoucissements', and to allow him to write to his sister so that she could try to sort out his financial affairs, which request was granted;⁴³ he also asked Berryer to intercede on his behalf with de Machault.⁴⁴ Lenglet wrote to his sister to give notice on his apartment and to arrange for the payment of his debts; he requested that she look after 'la pauvre dame qui m'a rendu service depuis tant d'années très généreusement',⁴⁵ and see that his little dog be given to someone, as well as sending him the clothes he needed in his captivity.⁴⁶ Mme de la Barre, his faithful support throughout all his difficult periods, replied in affectionate and encouraging terms, assuring him that she and her husband's family were doing everything in their power to procure his release, and promising to execute his wishes to the best of her ability.⁴⁷ In the event Berryer did recommend leniency towards the abbé, writing to the Comte d'Argenson:

L'abbé Lenglet du Fresnoy étant d'un âge très caduc, ayant près de 79 ans sujet à des infirmités, et promettant d'être fort circonspect à l'avenir, je pense qu'ayant égard à ces circonstances, on pourroit le rendre libre.⁴⁸

D'Argenson, predisposed no doubt in his favour, accordingly issued the order, and Lenglet signed out of the royal Château for the last time on 24th January 1752.⁴⁹

The aged abbé was still not quite as 'circonspect' as he had promised to be; we have seen in earlier chapters the lively interest he always took in the affairs of the Parlement, and in the Jansenist and Gallican controversies. The religious dissensions had flared up again with renewed intensity when in 1749 Christophe de Beaumont, appointed archbishop of Paris three years earlier, decided, following the lead given by other dioceses, to require dying persons suspected of Jansenist leanings to show a billet de Confession from a priest who accepted the Bull Unigenitus. If they failed in this requirement they were refused the last sacraments and Christian burial. Imbued with Richerist and Gallican ideas the Parlement intervened, issuing its own orders to have the sacraments administered to a number of appelants. The king failed to force the Parlement into submission, and resorted to the extreme measure of exiling its members to Pontoise in May 1753, where they remained for 15 months.⁵⁰ Lenglet became involved in the controversy, as he reported to Cardinal Passionei who himself had strong Jansenist sympathies:⁵¹ he had obviously been approached by members of the Parlement, and by certain of the bishops, to give his analysis of the situation, and with his knowledge of canon law to suggest ways of invalidating de Beaumont's orders. Lenglet insists on the aspect of innovation, which he claims is contrary to church tradition:

Quand on m'a parlé de cette nouvelle discipline, j'ai répondu qu'elle était contraire à l'esprit et à l'usage de l'Eglise Romaine. J'ai marqué à plusieurs conseillers du Parlement, qu'il fallait consulter le St Siège avant que d'aller en avant; et j'ai dit aux Ecclésiastiques et même à des Evêques, qu'ils devaient

suivre le rituel romain, où il n'est rien dit de cette discipline et que même ce refus était contraire aux usages de l'église.⁵²

Lenglet probably circulated his remarks, at least in manuscript 'Mémoire' form if not printed, despite his assurances to Passionei that he had published nothing on the subject.⁵³ In any case he did not hesitate to communicate his observations to the highest authority:

Je n'ai pas laissé de faire passer jusqu'au Roy quelques observations à ce sujet.⁵⁴

The administration was sufficiently worried by the lines of opposition Lenglet had indicated to put a stop to his foreign correspondence, especially that with Rome, for a period of time prior to 4th March 1754.⁵⁵ On the resumption of his correspondence with Passionei Lenglet continued to inform him of developments, expressing clearly, on a number of occasions, his view that the Parlements fulfilled a legitimising function vis-à-vis the monarchy,⁵⁶ and that the king would therefore be foolish not to recall that of Paris from Pontoise; moreover, the institutions of state could not function properly in its absence:

L'absence du Parlement de Paris et les mouvements des autres Parlements causent ici un dérangement qui ne pourra être bien rétabli que plus de 10 ans après son rappel.⁵⁷

He recounted, with a triumphant note, the steps taken by the king to recall the Parlement in June 1754, expressing his hopes that this would subdue the misplaced zeal of the bishops:

Sans quoi la Religion s'anéantira insensiblement par les duretés que l'on voudrait exercer sur les fidèles: sur des fidèles même très soumis à l'Eglise. Instruisez avec douceur et ramenez par la raison et par les principes de la Religion, mais point d'éclat que contre les refractaires et les rebelles. C'est ce que j'ai toujours dit ici et l'on sait que je ne suis rien moins que janséniste, Votre Excellence en rendrait témoignage,⁵⁸

strong words when one considers that the recipient was, after all, a Roman Cardinal. Finally Lenglet describes for Passionei the welcome given to the members of the Parlement on their return to Paris at the

end of August,⁵⁹ and, not without satisfaction, the banishment to Conflans of Christophe de Beaumont who was persisting in his stringent methods against those who were suspected of Jansenism. The abbé, who likes to see himself in the role of advisor to all sides, assures Passionei that:

J'ai prédit à quelques-uns de ses amis cette disgrâce, et je suis persuadé que le Roi sera obligé d'aller plus loin.⁶⁰

One of these contacts of whom Lenglet boasts among the higher clergy was M. de Luynes, Archevêque de Sens; it would appear that he was an accepted visitor in the salons of this great family,⁶¹ giving him access to yet another social milieu in addition to that of the robe scholars and the diplomat/administrators with which we have so often seen him associated. Lenglet was even involved in negotiations to have the Archbishop elevated to the rank of Cardinal, on the request of his brothers the Ducs de Luynes and de Chaulnes, and his nephew the Duc de Chevreuse. He was asked to use his contacts at the court of the 'Roi Jacques d'Angleterre' in an effort to have the Archbishop nominated to Rome.⁶² Lenglet also consulted Passionei on the affair; eventually in November 1754 M. de Sens was accorded the coveted title on the nomination of James Stuart.⁶³ Lenglet certainly believed that his intervention had been a significant one, and was able to exploit it in subsequent dealings with the new Cardinal who, he had always hoped, might procure him some material advantages.⁶⁴ In view of the importance and variety of Lenglet's 'political' connections it is all the more surprising that he himself never succeeded in moving into any official position within the church or the administration.

Lenglet and the encyclopedic spirit

The year 1751 saw the publication of a group of what might be described as 'encyclopedic' works, indicating once more the breadth of Lenglet's interests and knowledge, and his awareness of the demand for useful works in the area of the applied sciences; his collaboration in the Encyclopédie is a logical sequel to these publications. The Cours de chimie pour servir d'introduction à cette science⁶⁵ was closely related, as we have already noted, to Lenglet's works on alchemy.⁶⁶ We have seen that he was fond of performing his own experiments; he had, he informs us, even attended classes in chemistry.⁶⁷ It was his biographer Déon de Beaumont who asserted that Lenglet developed an interest in chemistry in his later years, but from his own statements to Passionei in January 1755 it would appear that he had always nurtured such an interest, particularly with regard to medical preparations:

J'ai 80 ans passés et je n'ai jamais eu besoin de médecin parce que lisant souvent des livres de médecine j'en copie tous les remèdes simples et j'en fais usage soit sur moi même soit sur les autres et je réussis presque toujours. J'en porte toujours un sur moi contre l'apoplexie.⁶⁸

Lenglet's edition was based primarily on the Traité de la chimie published by Nicolas Lefèvre in 1660, with additions from the work of the same name by Christophe Glaser published in 1663. A substantial proportion of the text - most of volumes IV and V, and a part of each of the other three volumes - is made up of 'additions' which for the most part are not attributed to their authors.⁶⁹ It appears that much of this material was from Lenglet's own pen, no doubt loosely based on those experiments which he had carried out over a number of years. As a result Lenglet ran into trouble with the censor:

Ce livre occasionna une petite contestation entre notre Auteur et M. Malouin, son Censeur; contestation qui pensa faire supprimer

l'ouvrage. M. Malouin prétendoit avec raison qu'il n'y avoit que les gens de l'Art qui dussent traiter ces sortes de matières; mais l'abbé Lenglet se piquoit d'y être fort versé. Il fit paroître son ouvrage sous un autre nom.⁷⁰

Malouin's objections were probably dictated by more than just a 'closed shop' mentality: this may have been an attempt to raise the science of chemistry out of the state of relative discredit which resulted from its associations with alchemy, which associations were evident in the case of our abbé.⁷¹ The pseudonym Lenglet adopted was that of a fictitious 'M. Du Monstier, Apoticaire de la Marine et des Vaisseaux du Roi, membre de la Société Royale de Londres et de celle de Berlin'; one version of the title-page carried the colophon 'Avec approbation et privilège du Roi',⁷² though the permission printed inside, and signed by Malouin in 1749, applied only to the works of Glaser and Le Fèvre. Presumably it was with Lenglet's 'nouvelles additions' that Malouin was unhappy, and thus Lenglet was contravening the censorship laws in publishing them at all, without defiantly printing an inappropriate approbation as well: he therefore omitted the above colophon from what would seem to have been the most common version of the title-page.

Another publishing venture in a related field, which appeared almost simultaneously, was the Métallurgie, ou l'art de tirer et de purifier les métaux, traduite de l'espagnol d'Alphonse Barba, avec les dissertations les plus rares sur les mines et les opérations métalliques;⁷³

there had been a previous French translation of the seventeenth-century work published in Paris in 1730,⁷⁴ but Lenglet's edition contained a significant number of additions and a new translation of the text. Unfortunately, Lenglet did not see fit to adopt or develop Barba's

technique of illustration, which, as Jacques Proust had pointed out, had in some ways foreshadowed Diderot's plates for the Encyclopédie.⁷⁵ The dedication to M. Grassin, 'Directeur général des monnoyes de France', is signed Gosford, which is also the name in which the privilège was granted in July 1749. It has generally been assumed by bibliographers that this was simply a pseudonym of Lenglet's, but we have already seen the police reports which indicate that such a person did exist, and like many other Jacobite exiles had lived in Spain. It was probably he who translated the Spanish text, and possibly also a number of pieces from the transactions of the Royal Society in London,⁷⁶ but Lenglet was responsible for the editorial work: for the Dedication⁷⁷ and the Preface on the potential mineral wealth of France,⁷⁸ and for the collection of essays in the second volume. He presumably found it convenient to leave the edition in the name of Gosford, possibly to avoid the kind of trouble which arose with the censor of the Cours de chimie. The journalists who reviewed the edition were complimentary, those of Trévoux remarking that 'On trouvera beaucoup d'instruction dans toute cette nouvelle littérature',⁷⁹ while La Bigarure, published in Holland, asserted that the book 'pourra contribuer à donner à cet Art, qui est si essentiel aux choses de la vie, la perfection qui lui manque, et c'est une obligation que nous aurons à M. Gosford'.⁸⁰

Two other works of the same year relate back to Lenglet's very first published pieces, those pamphlets which he had written as an attack on Marie d'Agréda's Mystique cité de Dieu,⁸¹ and yet, at the same time, they are curiously close in many ways to other manifestations of that esprit encyclopédique with which he would publicly identify himself in the following years. The first was the Traité historique

et dogmatique sur les apparitions, les visions et les révélations particulières which we have already looked at, for it was written for the most part in 1697 in response to the Franciscan Père Clouzeil's Réponse à un libelle contre la Vénérable Mere Marie de Jesus.⁸² Lenglet, cautioned by his interviews with the Lieutenant de Police, did not publish it at that time, as he tells us in his Preface:

J'eus la précaution de ne le pas publier [...] C'était un fruit précoce, qui traitait sur tout d'une matière délicate et trop importante pour m'hazarder à le faire paraître.⁸³

The occasion which spurred him to re-edit his manuscript was the publication in 1746 of Dom Augustin Calmet's Traité sur les apparitions des esprits, et sur les vampires ou les revenants de Hongrie; Lenglet's observations on this work became a chapter in the final published version of his Traité, in which he attacks Calmet for not providing his reader with the critical apparatus necessary to judge the truth - or more generally, Lenglet suggests, the falsity - of the 'histoires' and the 'faits' he reports. The main thrust of Lenglet's own work is, as we have seen, to suggest principles by which one might judge stories of apparitions and revelations; the young Lenglet's text is weak and muddled, still showing the marks of his scholastic training.⁸⁴ Contrary to what one would have expected from the author of La Méthode pour étudier l'histoire he does not attempt to develop any argument based on the idea of historical truth or certainty; rather he adopts a more traditional style of apologetics, but frequently undermines standard arguments with strong doses of irony. The first chapter of volume II is devoted specifically to the Marie d'Agréda affair; it incorporates much of the pamphlet published under the title Abrégé des disputes, while Lenglet's Lettre à Messieurs les Doyen... is reprinted in the 'Pièces' concerning the same affair which make up the second half of this volume.⁸⁵ Lenglet's

attack on the Cité mystique de Dieu is more virulent and direct than in the essays published earlier; he openly asserts that the work was written not by Marie d'Agréda, but by one of her spiritual directors, 'homme habile cependant, qui avait beaucoup lu'.⁸⁶ His demonstration is interesting in view of the fact that Marie d'Agréda had again been proposed for canonisation in 1730, and the decision was still pending.⁸⁷

The bulk of the work was, therefore, written in 1697, but it had since been revised and modernised; it was finally published with a significant number of additional pieces, such as, for example, a 'Discours historique' on the conversion of Constantine by the abbé de Lestocq, Lenglet's former master in the Sorbonne.⁸⁸ With his usual political acumen he quoted profusely, and in highly adulatory terms, from De Servorum Dei canonizatione by the former Cardinal Prosper Lambertini, now Pope Benedict XIV, friend of Passionei and of a number of scholars and free-thinkers throughout Europe.⁸⁹ Lenglet first mentioned his Traité to Passionei as early as April 1748,⁹⁰ and expressed the hope that he would soon be able to send it to Rome. He added that:

Il a été lu par tout ce qu'il y a ici de plus habile même par Mgr le Chancelier qui tous en ont été contents.⁹¹

But in the following June Lenglet informs Passionei that he has run into trouble in trying to have the work printed, first in Paris and then in Avignon, where 'l'affaire de Marie d'Agréda embarasse les Examineurs'; therefore he is having a copy of the offending Chapter XI made and sent to the Cardinal 'pour voir s'il y auroit effectivement quelque endroit contraire aux intentions de Sa Sainteté', which he would correct in the hope that the Vatican would then instruct the examiners in Avignon to give the work their approval.⁹² In September,

however, we find him sending the whole work in manuscript to Rome through the papal vice-legate in Paris;⁹³ he is even contemplating having it printed in Rome under the Cardinal's patronage in the event of a favourable reply.⁹⁴ By September 1749 he has returned to his previous choice of Avignon as the place of publication, and he has at last received the papal approval he was seeking: he proposes to translate and publish the Pope's letter with the work.⁹⁵ It was in April 1750 that definite moves towards publication were made, as Lenglet recounted to Passionei:

J'ai remis a M. Berryer, mon ancien ami et Lieutenant general de Police mon ms. des apparitions, pour prendre des mesures avec M. le Comte d'Argenson afin que je le puisse imprimer ici secrete-ment, sans passer par les mains du Chancelier: et j'en attens reponse. Tous deux sont gens de lettres, et chercheront à me faire ce plaisir.⁹⁶

As we have seen Lenglet had, in fact, spent the early part of this year in the Bastille, and the Comte d'Argenson, now the Minister responsible for the administration of Paris, had contributed to his release. Whether 'ici' means specifically Paris we cannot be certain, but the colophon on the published work read 'A Avignon, et se trouve à Paris, chez Jean-Noel Leloup', which, together with certain typographical indications, would suggest that the work was indeed printed in the capital.⁹⁷ This kind of formula was often agreed with the administration on the granting of a permission tacite: it would not have fooled the public, but it theoretically protected the royal authority which could not openly admit to allowing 'irregular' books to be printed in the capital of the kingdom, and without the royal imprimatur.⁹⁸

There was surprisingly little reaction to the work in the periodical press, though Grimm did mention it in highly dismissive terms in his Correspondance littéraire:

Le célèbre abbé Lenglet du Fresnoy, qui a écrit si hardiment sur l'histoire et sur les religions, finit par être trop crédule. Il vient de publier un Traité historique et dogmatique[..] C'est un ramassis fait sans ordre, sans goût, sans style et sans philosophie, de tous les contes qu'ont fait des visionnaires anciens et modernes. Cet ouvrage a le sort qu'il mérite. ⁹⁹

His remarks on Lenglet's credulity are not, as we have seen, substantiated by a close inspection of the work. There were also some responses from individual writers, chief among them being the injured Dom Augustin Calmet.¹⁰⁰ He reproaches Lenglet for not consulting the second and third editions of his work which had appeared before the Traité, and in which he had himself amended many of those passages for which Lenglet was subsequently to take him to task.¹⁰¹ But much more serious are his attacks on Lenglet's attitudes and arguments on the subject of the supernatural. He recalls the way in which Lenglet had undermined the visions and revelations ascribed not only to the great saints such as Francis, Brigid and Catherine of Siena, but to the Church Fathers themselves,¹⁰² and shows that he has not been slow to see the implications of Lenglet's rationalistic examinations:

M. l'Abbé du Fresnoy reconnaît les visions et les révélations qui sont clairement marquées dans l'Ecriture, mais n'y a-t-il pas lieu de craindre, que certaines gens n'y appliquent les règles de critique qu'il emploie contre les visions des Saints dont il parle dans son Ouvrage.¹⁰³

He implicitly includes Lenglet among those whom he categorises as 'libertins' and 'esprits forts' trying to undermine the church's doctrine,¹⁰⁴ and certainly provided our abbé with no small degree of amusement by terminating his Preface with an amazingly naïve statement of that 'circular' argument on scripture and revelations to which I have already referred:

Ce qui m'a principalement détourné de donner des règles et de prescrire une méthode pour discerner les vraies et les fausses apparitions, c'est que je suis très persuadé que la manière dont elles arrivent, nous est absolument inconnue, qu'elle enferme des

difficultés insurmontables; et qu'à ne consulter que la raison et les règles de la Philosophie, je serais plus porté à les croire impossibles qu'à en assurer la vérité et la possibilité. Mais je suis retenu par le respect des Saintes Ecritures, par le témoignage de toute l'Antiquité, et par la tradition de l'Eglise.¹⁰⁵

Thus even a cursory comparison with the assumptions and beliefs of this eminent and respected theologian underlines the degree of critical rationalism with which Lenglet's analyses were imbued, even if much in his methodology still separated him from a Grimm or a Diderot. With regard to Calmet the wily abbé had the last word, for the unfortunate Benedictine made the mistake of giving his work to De Bure, with whom, as we have seen, Lenglet was closely associated. Calmet must have been astounded on receipt of his copy to find a number of notes added to his Preface, like the one on the first passage quoted above which read:

Quel parallèle! Pourrait-on le faire sans renoncer au sens commun? or the response to Calmet's conclusion on the subject of the visions and revelations of the saints accepted by the church - 'N'aurait-il pas mieux valu laisser le monde à cet égard comme il est' - which read:

Excellente maxime pour fomenter la crédulité et nourrir la superstition!¹⁰⁶

Lenglet subsequently denied having anything to do with the writing of these notes, which he attributed to the abbé Le Mascrier who edited Calmet's edition,¹⁰⁷ but it is more than a coincidence that the two abbés were working for the same publisher, and Lenglet's influence, be it direct or indirect, is undeniable. From Lenglet's erudite biographer Michault came a vindication of the Preface which had so shocked Calmet:

La Préface du Traité des Apparitions, est une des meilleures que l'Auteur ait composée; il y parle du moins sérieusement; on peut même dire qu'il y tient le langage d'un Théologien profond.¹⁰⁸

A closely related work, dated 1751/52, is a Recueil de dissertations

anciennes et nouvelles, sur les apparitions, les visions et les

songes.¹⁰⁹ This also contains a long Preface, which Lenglet intended as a supplement to his Traité; here he deals principally with the historical dimension which he had neglected in the preceding work. He expounds the need to apply the rules of historical evidence to reportedly supernatural phenomena:

La vérité des faits historiques, surtout de ceux qui sont extraordinaires, ne se prouve point par la possibilité. Il faut pour y ajouter foi des témoignages suffisants et capables de déterminer un esprit judicieux [...] Ces sortes d'événements [...] demandent néanmoins pour être crus, les mêmes preuves qu'on emploie pour constater la vérité des faits humains, qui peuvent en quelque sorte influencer sur la conduite de la vie; autrement on pourrait ajouter foi à toutes les chimères qui passeraient dans l'imagination de ces gens mélancoliques.¹¹⁰

He applies such critical methods, along with his knowledge of chronology, to a number of stories of apparitions, and demonstrates their inherent contradictions.¹¹¹ Many of them, he repeatedly remarks, were the products of heated imaginations in an ignorant age, when men were not even allowed to doubt their authenticity:

C'est ainsi [...] qu'on amusait autrefois la simplicité du peuple: et il y avait du danger je ne dis pas à nier, [mais] même à paraître douter de ces aventures merveilleuses. Il n'en fallait pas davantage pour se faire traiter d'incrédule. On est aujourd'hui plus circonspect, parce qu'on est beaucoup plus éclairé.¹¹²

In which conclusion he seems to be justified when one finds the Mémoires de Trévoux greeting his Preface with what is for them the unusually adulatory comment:

On lira la Préface de l'Auteur dans le dessein de s'instruire, et parmi plusieurs Règles qu'elle contient, et qui sont judicieuses, on disputera peut-être sur quelques-unes,¹¹³

which rules they go on to debate more or less on the terms posed by Lenglet.

As regards the 'Dissertations' themselves Lenglet has no pretensions to

being a discriminating editor: he has included all sorts of pieces, and does not feel obliged to make any judgements on their quality or content, in which he would seem to be committing the very sin for which he attacked Dom Calmet in his Traité. Not that his edition is devoid of notes: J.-B. Michault reproached the abbé with having overloaded an excellent essay by M. Meyer, Professor of Philosophy at the University of Halle, with a mixture of importunate erudition and superficial comments.¹¹⁴ Michault would have preferred a smaller work composed of pieces of the standard of the Meyer essay, instead of the mixed bag which Lenglet compiled; but the abbé's object was, as always, to squeeze the maximum number of volumes out of the available material, and, as the abbé Gachet d'Artigny maliciously remarked, 'le travail ne languit pas, quand on ramasse indifféremment tout ce qui tombe sous la main'.¹¹⁵ D'Artigny had good reason to be sarcastic, for we have seen that Lenglet had a habit of stealing his material: the former had lately proposed to De Bure an edition of the story of Soeur Alis de Tésieux, whereupon Lenglet, having no doubt been asked for his opinion on the project, had promptly taken up d'Artigny's reference to a copy of the work in a Parisian library, and had published it in his Recueil.¹¹⁶ His last volume included the inevitable 'Liste des principaux auteurs qui ont traité des esprits, démons, apparitions, songes, magie et spectres', which all commentators praised as the most valuable part of the edition,¹¹⁷ even if Michault does refer to the author rather slyly as 'le Bibliothécaire des Maniaques, des Magiciens et des Sorciers'.¹¹⁸

It was apparently in the course of revising his Traité that Lenglet had conceived the idea of also publishing a Recueil of the pieces he had been studying: he mentioned such a project to Passionei in October 1748,

at that time contemplating two volumes to be printed in Holland.¹¹⁹ The final version consisted of two tomes, usually bound in four volumes; it was undoubtedly published under the same conditions as the Traité, and originally bore the same colophon, though re-dated 1752 and therefore probably published some months later.¹²⁰ However, if Lenglet had successfully negotiated the tolerance of the state authorities, he was not so lucky with the Church, and in 1754 he heard that his book was about to be put on the Papal Index. He appealed to the ministry to lift their ban on his foreign correspondence in order to ask for Passionei's help in the matter; the censure related to some of the pieces he had published rather than what he had written himself, and Lenglet undertook to add in '3 Observations' as a corrective.¹²¹ In practical terms, it seems extraordinary to contemplate adding material to a work two years after publication, and Lenglet's offers were probably more symbolic than real: very probably he had just a few sheets printed to insert into the copies of the Recueil which he sent to Rome.¹²² He was, however, anxious to remain on good terms with the Holy See, as he assured Passionei with a rather back-handed compliment:

Vous savez, Mr, que comme on s'embarrasse peu à Rome d'un arrêt du Parlement, [...] de même plusieurs français s'inquiètent fort peu d'un décret de l'Index. Mais je ne pense pas de même: et soumis au St Siege plus que ne le sont bien de mes compatriotes, j'appréhende toute proscription de la part de ce tribunal.¹²³

Lenglet succeeded through Passionei's negotiations in having the censure withdrawn;¹²⁴ he finally sent the Cardinal a corrected copy on 7th October 1754.¹²⁵

In view of the nature of Lenglet's interests at this time - that 'goût pour les arts utiles'¹²⁶ which expressed itself in his edition of Barba's Métallurgie and Lefèvre's Cours de chimie, and the sceptical

interest in supernatural phenomena set in the context of his central concern with history and its critical methodology - it is not surprising that he should have been attracted to the great project undertaken by a 'société de gens de lettres' under the direction of Diderot and d'Alembert. How Lenglet came into contact with the leading

Encyclopédistes we cannot be certain; there may have been a chance meeting, for example between Lenglet and Diderot who we know were both frequenting the Bibliothèque du Roi in the late 1740 s,¹²⁷ or an introduction through David, one of the publishers of the Encyclopédie, who had recently been associated with the publication of Lenglet's edition of the Mémoires de la régence. Or the contact may have been made through the abbé Edme Mallet, 'professeur à la Sorbonne', a fairly moderate ecclesiastic who, though many years Lenglet's junior, may well have circulated in those erudite academic circles with which our abbé was associated.¹²⁸ The more radical of the Encyclopédistes tended to be connected rather with the Académie des Sciences, whatever the faults with which Diderot might reproach it, than with the Académie des Inscriptions, on the perimeter of which Lenglet circulated: Jacques Proust has pointed out just how many of the contributors belonged to the former institution, the most prominent being of course d'Alembert himself.¹²⁹ Not that the scholars of the robe class were necessarily divorced from the activities of the philosophes proper: Montesquieu, whose support the editors were proud to advertise, is an eminent proof to the contrary, and Diderot rendered tribute in his Prospectus to Claude Sallier for the help he had given them as custodian of the royal library.¹³⁰ Lenglet was actually engaged to deal with material which had originally been ascribed to Mallet; in the first volumes the latter was responsible for many of the articles concerning 'la Poésie, l'Eloquence,

et en général la Littérature', as well as 'tous les articles d'Histoire ancienne et moderne'.¹³¹ But the editors themselves began to furnish articles in the field of history, and in the preliminaries to volume III (published in 1753) they announced that 'M. l'Abbé Lenglet du Fresnoy a bien voulu revoir les articles qui concernent l'Histoire et nous en a même donné quelques-uns en entier'.¹³² This was the first volume to be published after the suspension which followed the 'affaire de Prades', and that crisis may also have been instrumental in involving Lenglet in the project: with the withdrawal of the abbés de Prades, Pestré and Yvon, Mallet may well have found himself somewhat overburdened in the work he had undertaken,¹³³ and looked around for collaborators. Moreover, the editors had become highly sensitive about the repeated charges of plagiarism made against them, and may have wanted to protect themselves by having Lenglet, with his notoriously good memory, check over Mallet's work. Or indeed Lenglet himself, like many other contributors, including Voltaire and Montesquieu, may have been stirred to offer his services precisely as a result of the opposition to the work, and the defection of some of the contributors: he was never a man to be frightened by censors or threats of the Bastille. This seems all the more likely in view of the fact that Lenglet, always such a keen defender of his interests with the libraires, insisted that his work for the Encyclopédie be unremunerated. D'Alembert commented on the fact in the obituary which he published in volume VI of the Encyclopédie:

Quelquefois assez vif, quelquefois aussi indifférent sur ses propres intérêts, il a voulu que son travail pour l'Encyclopédie fût absolument gratuit.¹³⁴

Though it is true that a majority of the contributors likewise worked without pay, nonetheless a number of the 'professional', and therefore

impecunious men of letters, including abbés like Mallet, Yvon and Morellet, did receive a modest payment.¹³⁵ Lenglet's renunciation therefore suggests an unprecedented degree of ideological commitment on his part, whose significance cannot be measured solely in terms of the quantitative or qualitative contribution which he actually made to the project.

In all Lenglet contributed 36 articles in volume III, 18 in volume IV, and 1 in volume V which appeared after his death;¹³⁶ to some he added just a specified paragraph or subsection, others (23 in all) were apparently written jointly with Mallet, and approximately half the total number were written solely by Lenglet. In the main they were short items, of a highly descriptive nature, devoted to terms and institutions in the realm of modern history. Few had any critical content whatsoever, and can scarcely have excited the editors of the work; interestingly, after one such dull article by Mallet and Lenglet under the rubric 'Champion, s.m. (Hist.mod.)', d'Alembert added a section quoting Montesquieu and giving a critical perspective on the institution of chivalry. He began:

C'est un spectacle curieux, dit l'illustre auteur de l'Esprit des Lois, de voir ce monstrueux usage du combat judiciaire réduit en principes, et de trouver le corps d'une jurisprudence si singulière.¹³⁷

Such an approach is conspicuously absent from most of Lenglet's contributions. D'Alembert did single out two of his articles for special mention in his obituary: these were the most substantial pieces, 'Constitution' which ran to almost ten pages, and 'Diplome et Diplomatie', slightly shorter, also in volume IV. The former contained a clear exposé of the evolution of the government and institutions of the Empire from the time of Charlemagne, and was well-

informed and uncontroversial. More contentious was the article on 'Diplomatique': here Lenglet casts serious doubts on the authenticity of many of the titles and charters of the middle-ages, especially those on which were founded many of the privileges and immunities of the religious orders. We have already seen manifestations of the abbé's dislike for the regular clergy, whom he always portrayed as greedy and over-privileged; this was an ideal chance to strike at the foundations of their wealth. He does, however, consider the arguments which had been opposed to his scepticism. He grants the seriousness and importance of Dom Jean Mabillon's great work De re diplomatica published in 1681, but adds:

On doit regarder cet écrivain comme un pere de famille qui cherche à défendre les biens qui lui sont acquis par une longue possession. ¹³⁸

He hammers his point home in his concluding comments:

Que l'on fasse attention après ce que nous venons de marquer, que cette soupçonneuse exactitude, ces recherches critiques et inquiétantes ne regardent ordinairement que les titres des abbayes des communautés régulières, et même des églises Cathédrales. Il semble que ceux qui devroient le moins être gouvernés par l'intérêt, et en qui l'on croiroit trouver l'amour de la vérité, ceux-là mêmes, dis-je, ne craignent point d'abandonner tout ce que l'honneur et la religion prescrivent, pour se jeter dans des crimes inutiles pour eux-mêmes, et qui ne sont avantageux qu'à une communauté, qui ne leur en sait aucun gré, et qui, malgré quelques déférences extérieures, les regarde, ou du moins les a regardés comme ce qu'ils avoient le malheur d'être réellement, c'est-à-dire comme des faussaires. ¹³⁹

Lenglet's attack was answered by the Benedictine authors of the Nouveau traité de diplomatique published from 1750 to 1765. They underline, with considerable justification, how indefensible are many of Lenglet's sweeping statements, in which he even contradicts some of the assertions of his own earlier works:

Quels paradoxes cet auteur n'y avance-t-il pas! A proprement parler, cet article n'est qu'un assemblage d'accusations destituées de preuves, qu'un tissu de déclamations frivoles, extraites de la Méthode pour étudier l'histoire, et réfutées dans notre premier tome. L'auteur prétend néanmoins donner des règles de Diplomatique, mais quelles règles! ¹⁴⁰

But d'Alembert nonetheless came to Lenglet's defence when he terminated his obituary with the remark:

Nous ne sommes point étonnés de voir M. l'Abbé Lenglet combattu par de savans Religieux, qui peuvent être aussi fondés qu'intéressés à défendre l'opinion contraire.¹⁴¹

Lenglet's contribution to the Encyclopédie was brought to an abrupt end by his death in January 1755. Diderot wished to have someone present at the lifting of the seals on his books and papers so that he could acquire the material which the abbé had already prepared for him; he promised the principal publisher, Le Breton, that he would himself take over the work which had been apportioned to Lenglet.¹⁴² In the 'Inventaire après décès' carried out in Lenglet's apartment in the rue de la Harpe there is effectively recorded a visit from 'S. André François le Breton Imprimeur' whose business was located in the same street.¹⁴³ He came ostensibly about twelve 'reconnaisances de souscription' for Lenglet's Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc¹⁴⁴ which the abbé had asked him to sell; Le Breton had probably undertaken this service because Lenglet was working for the Encyclopédie. He handed over the the sum of 21 livres for two subscriptions, and the remaining ten unsold receipts, to the bailiffs, and no doubt established discreetly if there was anything to interest him among the abbé's papers. Since he had not paid Lenglet for his work he could not have claimed the material, but could well have bid for some of the innumerable manuscript 'morceaux sur l'histoire' which were subsequently put up for sale.¹⁴⁵

It is clear, however, that the esteem and commitment Lenglet evidently felt for the Encyclopédie and its editors was not returned by the philosophes; to most of them this old man, now almost eighty years of age, was a remnant from a past age, whose personal and literary profile

was tarnished with ambiguities and inconsistencies too great for even their motley group to encompass. When d'Alembert wrote his éloge, he was very obviously fulfilling a duty for which he had really little taste, and the terms he employs are often less than lukewarm: Lenglet was 'un de nos plus laborieux écrivains', whose works are 'dignes de curiosité pour les recherches qu'ils contiennent'. He is openly reproached for his inelegant and unpolished style, as well as for his careless errors:

Son style [était] extrêmement négligé; heureusement la plupart des matières qu'il a traitées étant de pure érudition, les vices de la diction peuvent s'y pardonner plus aisément. Il écrivoit comme il parloit, avec beaucoup de rapidité, et par cette raison il paroissoit mieux parler qu'il n'écrivoit: son peu de fortune ne lui laissoit pas toujours le tems de revoir ses écrits avant que de les publier; cette raison doit faire excuser les méprises qui s'y trouvent.¹⁴⁶

There is no doubt that d'Alembert was put off by the lack of any consistent viewpoint or evaluative stance in the abbé's oeuvre. There is nonetheless a clear bias in his remarks, and one can understand Gibbon's annoyance at d'Alembert and the 'philosophic age' for their scorning of the great traditions of erudition,¹⁴⁷ which tended to lead to a new imbalance, as Peter Gay has underlined:

Enlightenment historians, anxious to avoid petty detail for the sake of larger vistas, often sacrificed scrupulous citation to literary form, precision to elegance.¹⁴⁸

D'Alembert's critical stance is shared by others in the philosophe group, who likewise saw Lenglet as a confused and somewhat unintelligent érudit. Grimm was to write rather cruelly on hearing of his death:

L'abbé Lenglet du Fresnoy, un des plus savants hommes du siècle, est mort il y a quelques jours. C'était un écrivain infatigable qui a donné plus de cent volumes en différents genres. Sa Méthode pour étudier l'histoire est son meilleur ouvrage. C'était un homme de peu d'esprit, mauvais raisonneur, mais d'une mémoire prodigieuse. On avait appelé l'abbé d'Olivet, l'abbé Lenglet et Piron, don Jugement, dame Mémoire, et demoiselle Imagination [...]. Nous venons de faire une perte bien plus considérable, et que nous ne sommes pas près de réparer, celle de l'auteur de l'Esprit des Lois [...].¹⁴⁹

And Voltaire himself, on his distant relations with whom Lenglet prided himself, was often sharply critical. He repeatedly attacked Lenglet for including in his historical works fables such as the story of 'un archevêque de Mayence [...] assiégé et mangé par des rats', lamenting that:

L'Abbé Lenglet compile, compile ces impertinences; et les almanachs les ont cent fois répétées; est c'est ainsi qu'on a instruit la jeunesse; et toutes ces fadaïses sont entrées dans l'éducation des princes.¹⁵⁰

Whatever definition one may give of the esprit philosophique, it is evident that the key figures in the encyclopedic group did not feel that Lenglet possessed it.

France and its history: the final endeavour

Lenglet's two last published works were once again in the field of history, and were originally intended to form part of a major study on France, the Plan de l'histoire générale et particulière de la monarchie française. The abbé was side-tracked by the history of Joan of Arc, and decided to publish a separate work on the subject: to test public reaction, as he would have us believe. His motivations were not altogether so straightforward, however; the main reason for his haste in publishing was that he was once again in competition with the unfortunate abbé d'Artigny, and with his own publisher De Bure, and wanted to get his work into print before they could respond to the threat. D'Artigny published the details of this incident after Lenglet's death:¹⁵¹ in January 1753 De Bure, publisher of d'Artigny's Nouveaux mémoires d'histoire, de critique et de littérature, wrote to that abbé on the

subject of a manuscript 'Histoire de la Pucelle d'Orléans' by Edmond Richer, a famous Docteur de Sorbonne of the seventeenth century.¹⁵² He suggested that d'Artigny take on the task of editing this work which he, De Bure, would publish, having already taken the advice of 'M. l'Abbé Lenglet and M. de Burigny';¹⁵³ he detailed for d'Artigny a number of recommendations made by Lenglet on the abridgement and modernisation of Richer's text. D'Artigny eventually accepted the project, remarking that:

Afin que tout semblât concourir à fixer mes irrésolutions, M. l'Abbé Lenglet m'offrit obligeamment de chercher à la Bibliothèque du Roi les pièces qui m'étoient nécessaires pour perfectionner l'Ouvrage de Richer,¹⁵⁴

and so he set to work. What then was his astonishment to hear within a short time that the abbé Lenglet was in the process of publishing a history of the Maid of Orléans. When he finally got hold of a copy he found that the content was almost exactly as in the Richer manuscript:

preuve évidente que Richer avoit travaillé sur de bons mémoires; et rien ne lui fait plus d'honneur que cette surprenante conformité de travail avec M. Lenglet, qu'on ne soupçonnera pas de l'avoir copié, puisqu'il n'a gardé l'ancien manuscrit que trois ou quatre mois.¹⁵⁵

Lenglet did not initially acknowledge any debt to Richer; yet the whole conception and lay-out of the work follow exactly that of the manuscript as described by d'Artigny. The first part was devoted to the history of Joan up to the time of her execution, and included an account of the trials at Rouen where she was condemned, which was based, Lenglet insisted, on the 'pièces originales du temps'.¹⁵⁶ Part II contained an account of the posthumous trials where she was rehabilitated, and a Catalogue which Lenglet added of manuscripts and books relating to the Maid. Part III, which was published at a later date, was composed of 'Divers témoignages en faveur de Jeanne d'Arc', for which much of the

material had again been put together by Richer; this was followed by some items compiled by Lenglet, including two of his own composition, the first on the different theories which had been formulated to explain 'le phenomene de la Pucelle d'Orléans', the second a dissertation comparing Joan's heroic courage with that of other women. That Lenglet used some of the manuscript material available in Paris to correct and supplement Richer is indubitable - he gives references from a wide variety of sources in his Prefaces;¹⁵⁷ but that he copied great tracts of Richer's work, often uncritically, and that this material was the main foundation of his edition, is also undeniable. The critics in the Journal des savants hinted that Lenglet had even copied the errors of the original,¹⁵⁸ and in his Preface to Part III Lenglet was forced to admit the truth of this accusation in some specific instances. There can be no doubt that his haste to publish the work before d'Artigny led him to give only superficial attention to the corrections which were needed, and which he was in an ideal position to carry out.

Lenglet did, however, modify the Richer text in a number of interesting ways. Chief among these is his treatment of the central question of Joan's motivation and the origin of her 'mission'. Richer had a simple and uncritical belief in a direct divine inspiration informing all Joan's actions, and had no doubts as to their miraculous nature;¹⁵⁹ Lenglet, no doubt in a moment of inattention, repeated a few such assertions in his text.¹⁶⁰ The whole thrust of his interpretation is, nonetheless, in a different direction. M. Jerom Vercruysse, in his article on 'Jeanne d'Arc au siècle des Lumières', points out that Lenglet had broached the subject of Jeanne d'Arc's inspiration as far back as 1735,¹⁶¹ in his Histoire justifiée contre les romans.¹⁶² There he

had adopted his common technique of quoting 'les incrédules' at great length, in this case the Protestant Du Haillan, who propounded the thesis that the Pucelle's actions were directed by political intriguers. But Lenglet added that Jeanne's courage and victories must surely be proof of God's guiding hand in the affair, and so he apparently rejected Du Haillan's analysis. Yet, as so often with our abbé, the strong voice which he allowed to his supposed 'adversary' lingers in the reader's mind long after Lenglet's brief refutation is forgotten. In the preface to the Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc he indeed tells us that he was formerly 'autant et plus prévenu peut-être qu'aucun autre' against the authenticity of Jeanne's mission, suspecting some kind of fraud, but he has changed his mind.¹⁶³ He now puts forward a different thesis:

De croire que cette fille ait eu des visions, des apparitions, des révélations de Saints et de Saintes, je me suis déjà expliqué au commencement de cet Ouvrage; je n'en crois rien. J'abandonne cette pieuse créance à des personnes d'un esprit moins rétif que le mien. Mais à ces apparitions je substitue une persuasion intérieure, une méditation réfléchie qui frappe, qui anime, qui agite fortement l'imagination; et ce sont les efforts de cette dernière faculté qui souvent nous représentent comme réels des objets qui ne sont que de simples images, que nous nous formons en nous même.¹⁶⁴

This theory of autosuggestion is quickly linked by the author with certain physiological conditions which produce hallucinations, and this in turn leads him back to a general discussion of visions and apparitions, linking this text with his recent works on the subject:

On sait que la chose est commune en quelques maladies particulières où l'homme infirme se représente tout ce qui n'est pas, et qu'il croit néanmoins aussi réel que s'il existait effectivement. Soyez persuadés qu'en matière de piété la chose se passe de même. Une âme appliquée, une âme vivement affectée d'un objet, croit voir tout ce qui a rapport à cet objet. Elle le voit cependant, mais dans son imagination. Elle peut dire, sans péché, qu'elle a vu, qu'elle a ouï ce que d'autres n'ont ni vu, ni entendus. Et c'est ainsi qu'on doit même expliquer grand nombre de visions et d'apparitions, que l'on trouve dans la vie de ces saintes âmes, qui font le sujet de notre admiration.¹⁶⁵

There seems to be little room in Lenglet's interpretation for the workings of the supernatural, but he does introduce at various points a guiding, if very distant, Providence:

Et comme dans tout ce qu'elle [Jeanne] entreprenait il s'agissait d'un bien général, comme il était question de la tranquillité de tout un Royaume, il est hors de doute qu'alors il y avait sur elle une direction particulière de la Providence, sans laquelle rien d'utile, rien de vertueux, rien de généreux ne s'entreprend et ne réussit.¹⁶⁶

However, although M. Vercruysse categorises Lenglet as one of the supporters of the 'thèse providentialiste', it would seem that this is to take such incidental comments rather too much at face value, and to forget that Lenglet, as a cleric, could not afford to be too open and categorical in his rejection of the supernatural: we have seen that copies of all his works of these later years were sent to his patron Passionei in Rome, and some were transmitted to the Pope. Lenglet was walking a fine line between expressing what would seem to be his intellectual convictions, yet retaining the approval of the relatively 'enlightened' church establishment in Rome. Thus in parts of the text other than the Preface we find even stronger argumentation in favour of a naturalistic explanation of Jeanne's 'enthousiasme'; the most interesting section is that in Part III where Lenglet describes the 'Divers systèmes imaginés pour expliquer le phénomène de la Pucelle d'Orléans'. He castigates those biographers who believed in a direct intervention either of the Devil or of God. The latter group, he tells us:

prétendent qu'elle était continuellement comme obsédée ou du moins environnée d'Anges et de Saintes, qu'elle était accablée de révélation, de visions et d'apparitions.¹⁶⁷

Mentioning, on the other hand, the theories which suggest that the story of Jeanne was a fable fabricated after the reign of Charles VII, he concludes:

Je ne rapporte ce sentiment que pour montrer les extravagances dans lesquelles se jettent quelques personnes, qui veulent parler seules, et s'épargner les frais des recherches et du raisonnement,¹⁶⁸

both of which latter methodologies he feels he has used to the full in the interpretation which he has himself embraced. According to this 'sixième système':

C'était [...] une forte persuasion intérieure de réussir dans l'objet qu'elle s'étoit proposé, et cette persuasion étoit accompagnée d'une ferme et constante imagination, d'autant plus vive, qu'elle se trouvait animée par un reflux d'humeurs, qui selon la déposition du Sieur Daulon, n'ayant point d'issue par les conduits ordinaires refluoient vers la tête et y faisoient beaucoup plus d'impression, que si elle eût été dans un autre état.¹⁶⁹

Thus Lenglet's theory of autosuggestion is now backed up by a physiological argument, which he has based on the evidence given at the trials, and of which he is the first of many proponents.¹⁷⁰ The rôle ascribed to Providence has become more and more imprecise, and indeed unnecessary:

Mais le merveilleux fut alors, qu'abandonnant le cours ordinaire de l'éducation des personnes du sexe, elle embrassa l'état militaire et y fit paraître un héroïsme conduit sans doute par la Providence: c'est toujours mon principe. Et par la même direction elle le communiqua aux siens et en priva l'ennemi qu'elle avait à combattre.¹⁷¹

The further Lenglet can banish the supernatural from man's field of behaviour, the better he is satisfied:

Ce sentiment m'a paru simple et dans l'ordre du véritable héroïsme. Si néanmoins quelqu'un en proposoit un plus simple et plus vraisemblable, je suis prêt d'abandonner celui que j'ai adopté, pour me jeter du côté de celui qui sera plus naturel.¹⁷²

Once again, then, it seems that caution is needed in weighing the significance of Lenglet's bows to Providence when balanced against the main thrust of his argument.

The material circumstances surrounding the publication of the Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc are interesting as an example of Lenglet's efforts to circumvent the libraires and conduct the printing and distribution

of his works himself. He relates some of the circumstances in a fascinating 'Mémoire pour l'abbé Lenglet Dufresnoy' which he sent to M. de Malesherbes, Directeur de la librairie, and which is preserved in the Anisson collection at the Bibliothèque Nationale.¹⁷³ Lenglet recounts his initial efforts to publish his work, but does not of course mention his hoodwinking of d'Artigny and De Bure:

L'abbé Lenglet ayant travaillé avec soin l'histoire de la Pucelle d'Orléans [...] il le proposa à quelques Libraires, qui le refusèrent sur différents prétextes.

Having shown his manuscript to Denis-François Secousse, his former associate, and to other scholars who were approbatory in their comments, Lenglet decided to have it printed at his own expense, thus falling foul of a number of booksellers:

Alors plusieurs libraires en conçurent de la jalousie, parce qu'ils ne veulent pas que les gens de Lettres aient la témérité de faire imprimer leurs ouvrages qu'eux Libraires ont refusés. C'est chez eux un crime capital. Ils veulent obliger les Savans à être leurs esclaves ou du moins leurs Valets: c'est ainsi que quelques uns d'entre eux se sont expliqués.

Lenglet, however, proceeded to have the first two parts of his work printed in Paris by Chardon, early in 1753, in an edition of 1,000 copies, and distributed by a number of booksellers in that city;¹⁷⁴ he also sold 150 copies to a bookseller in Orléans, Couret de Villeneuve, for whom a separate title-page was printed,¹⁷⁵ and he later negotiated further sales directly to booksellers in Holland.¹⁷⁶ Lenglet had built up a correspondence, which probably started with his search for material on Jeanne d'Arc, with a M. Daniel Polluche, member of a Société littéraire in Orléans. The latter served Lenglet in a number of ways, seeking out manuscript material, and sending him bibliographical notes, along with a dissertation of his own questioning whether Jeanne did actually die at the stake, and which Lenglet planned to publish in

his quarto edition; when Lenglet decided to have Part III of his work printed by Couret de Villeneuve in Orléans Polluche served as Lenglet's agent in the business.¹⁷⁷ The bargain they struck was as follows:

Comme il [de Villeneuve] ne tirerait point d'argent pour payer les exemplaires qu'il lui envoyait, de même cet abbé ne débourserait rien pour l'impression de la 3e partie, qu'il doit livrer gratuitement à ceux qui ont acquis les deux premières. Tel est l'engagement de l'abbé Lenglet, convenant même que l'imprimeur gagnerait encore sur la fabrique, d'autant plus que cet abbé lui payait un écu par feuille plus qu'on ne fait à Paris ainsi l'imprimeur gagnait doublement.¹⁷⁸

Despite his complaints, Lenglet had obviously hoped to save money by printing in Orléans, but he began to have regrets when the work dragged on for over seven months, whereas, he told Malesherbes, he could have had the 13 sheets printed in Paris 'en moins de 6 semaines'.¹⁷⁹ But when the work was completed he was faced with even greater problems in its distribution. The laws governing the publishing trade did not permit the transfer of a whole edition from the provinces to an individual in Paris,¹⁸⁰ so Lenglet appealed to a friend, 'le S. Gendron, libraire', to help him in the matter. Since Gendron was in turn a close friend of Didot, who held the powerful position of Syndic des libraires, he recommended that Lenglet have his work sent to Didot's address, and he, Gendron, would negotiate its safe transfer. In the event, however, Didot refused to release the copies to Lenglet; he was clearly angered by the idea of an individual writer having his work printed outside Paris. From this refusal arose Lenglet's 'Mémoire' requesting Malesherbes to intervene on his behalf for the recovery of his work. We find an interesting, and less restrained account of the events, their cause and their outcome in a letter to Polluche of 29th May 1754; it is worth quoting for the valuable information it gives us on the material conditions of the publishing trade in these middle years of the century:

Je n'ai recue qu'hier mes exemplaires de la 3e partie et j'ai été obligé d'oter le nom du Sr Couret de Villeneuve a la fin de cette partie et de ne laisser au frontispiece que le nom d'Orleans sans y mettre celui du Sieur Pissot libraire, vous le verrez par l'epreuve cy jointe qui s'imprime actuellement en voici la raison. L'imprimerie tombe beaucoup a Paris et se releve en Province ainsi on imprime ou mieux ou aussi bien a Chartres, Senlis, Amiens, Sainte Menehout, Reims, Orleans, et autres villes qu'on ne fait a Paris et meme plusieurs Libraires ont pris le parti de faire imprimer en Province ou l'on travaille a meilleur marché qu'ici. C'est à Senlis qu'on imprime actuellement la nouvelle Edition de Puffendorff in 4°. ¹⁸¹ Or Didot Syndic des libraires et Dombes viennent d'acheter une imprimerie et la veulent faire valoir: pour cela il faut qu'il ne paroisse pas que les imprimeries de Province vont de pair avec celles de Paris et ils ont obtenus que l'on otat le nom des Imprimeurs de Province auxquels on peut s'adresser. Il y a sur cette condescendance une double anecdote qui n'est pas du ressort d'une lettre. ¹⁸²

There may also have been other changes imposed on Lenget by the censors, perhaps at an earlier stage, for in July 1754 he tells Passionei that he will send him a copy of Part III 'telle que je l'ai faite; car on l'a aussi corrigée'. ¹⁸³ I have not found any material evidence of these changes.

Nothing daunted, however, Lenglet, who continued to find new material on the Pucelle, had already begun to make plans for a luxurious quarto edition with engravings, to be printed in just 250 copies. In January he asked Polluche to make inquiries in Orléans regarding the prices of the top grades of paper; ¹⁸⁴ Polluche's notes on the letter indicate that the types of paper Lenglet had specified were not available at all, and the prices he gave for that which was on offer did not please the abbé: he claimed that the best quality paper in Paris was cheaper than the poorest in Orléans. ¹⁸⁵ In view of this fact, and the other difficulties he had already encountered, coupled with the fact that the costs of labour were, it seemed after all, higher in Orléans, he would have the quarto edition printed in Paris where he could oversee the printing himself. ¹⁸⁶ He issued a Prospectus offering the work for subscription: ¹⁸

it should be attractive, he said, for large libraries, especially those of the regular communities, 'qui ne redoutent rien tant que les petits livres, qui s'égarent, se perdent ou s'emportent aisément'.¹⁸⁸ The new edition would contain those additions which Lenglet had projected including in a Part IV, and would be ready for delivery, he promised, on 1st November 1754.¹⁸⁹ However, he apparently had little success in finding subscribers: the inventory taken after his death details a 'petit livre [...] intitulé Souscription de l'Edition de l'histoire de la pucelle in quarto Ecrits seulement sur le premier feuille recto qui contient 2 articles'.¹⁹⁰ Despite this fact he proceeded with his plans up to his death in January 1755, at which time he was waiting for a copy of a manuscript from Rome over which Passionei had been stalling for months.¹⁹¹

One interesting item in the Prospectus was a 'Projet pour l'impression des grands ouvrages de littérature',¹⁹² which, Lenglet admits, 'j'ai copié en partie des Anglais nos voisins'; he was no doubt thinking of a venture such as the Society for the Encouragement of Learning founded in London in 1736 with the object of enabling authors to publish their works independently of the professional booksellers.¹⁹³ Lenglet proposes the establishment of a 'Compagnie littéraire' of four or six 'amateurs aisés', who would establish a fund of about 60,000 livres as backing for the publication of 'livres nécessaires ou utiles' which are so often refused by the booksellers. The authors could then be paid promptly, and the booksellers themselves could make a reasonable profit on their distribution without having to take any of the risks: this last remark was a half-hearted attempt to deal with the inevitable opposition which would arise from the latter group, to whom Lenglet in the same text

addresses a number of fairly sharp and ironic comments. Lenglet claims that he already has two interested parties 'qui se sont présentés généreusement d'eux-mêmes', and hopes others will join suit. He does not say with which works they should inaugurate their project, but he was presumably prepared to offer something of his own: perhaps a 'Système complet de la géographie universelle traduit de l'anglois et l'abrégé', for which Coustelier sold Lenglet the privilège in 1753.¹⁹⁴ It would have been interesting to see the evolution of Lenglet's project, but alas death intervened before the scheme could be put into operation.

The compte-rendus of Lenglet's work were in general approbatory in tone; those in the Mémoires de Trévoux were unusually elogious.¹⁹⁵

Lenglet's interpretation of the material was, however, reported in very different ways: the critic in L'Année littéraire¹⁹⁶ had picked up only those incidental references to the supernatural which we have already ascribed to Richer. He had evidently not read Lenglet's prefaces, and his summing-up is clearly inaccurate:

Il est toujours incertain que Jeanne Darc ait été suscitée de Dieu pour rétablir la Monarchie Française; plus incertain qu'elle ait eû des révélations, comme il paroît que l'Auteur le croit trop légèrement sur la foi de ses manuscrits.

The Bibliothèque impartiale had, on the other hand, seized what we have deemed to be the over-riding implications of Lenglet's interpretation:

L'auteur s'y propose, comme il s'en explique dans sa préface, de rapporter les exploits de la Pucelle, à un principe d'héroïsme, plutôt que de fanatisme. Il ne croit point que cette fille ait eu des visions, des apparitions, des révélations de Saints et de Saintes; mais il substitue à ces chimères une persuasion intérieure, une méditation réfléchie, qui frappe, qui anime, qui agite fortement l'imagination. De la manière dont l'abbé Lenglet Dufresnoy développe sa pensée, tout se réduit à mettre une folie à la place d'une autre.¹⁹⁷

The critic in the Journal des savants also perceived these implications,

though he avoided underlining them as forcefully as the former journal.

He concluded with the remark:

Nous devons sçavoir gré à l'Auteur, malgré son grand âge, d'avoir encore enrichi le public de cette production.¹⁹⁸

Lenglet's work was republished, but in a much abridged format, in 1759, and reissued in 1775; it was in part translated into English and published by George Ann Grave in 1812.

Three volumes of the Plan de l'histoire générale et particulière de la monarchie française were also published in Paris in 1753.¹⁹⁹ These formed Part I of the proposed four-part work, and were devoted to an 'abrégé chronologique' of French history; Lenglet justified his approach on the grounds that 'nous sommes dans le siècle des abrégés, qu'on voudroit apprendre beaucoup de choses en peu de mots, et presque même sans se donner la peine de lire'.²⁰⁰ The first volume covers the early settlement of the country, and the first and second dynasties; the second and third volumes concentrate on the history of the third dynasty up to 1747. The work is extremely superficial, inaccurate and badly written, and was condemned as such by all the critics;²⁰¹ it was inevitably compared, much to its discredit, with the Président Hénault's Nouvel abrégé chronologique de l'histoire de France which had been published in 1744, and was issued in a fourth edition with a supplement from 1752 to 1756.²⁰² Though many of its failings were typical of Lenglet's hurried productions, nonetheless his great age must have accounted for a general deterioration in standards, even in the material production of the book.²⁰³ It was published at his own expense: he acquired a privilège through De Bure, who had apparently applied for it on his own behalf on 17th April 1752, and transferred it to Lenglet four days later.²⁰⁴ Lenglet presumably adopted this procedure in order

to circumvent opposition from those with vested interests in the book-trade to his publishing his own works; he was able to exploit the same privilège for the publication of the Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc, and he used the same printer, Jacques Chardon.

The book ran into trouble on two accounts. Firstly, Lenglet had written a dedication to 'Monsieur le Comte de Chabannes, Lieutenant général des Armées du Roi, et Grand-Croix de l'Ordre Militaire de S. Louis', who was evidently a patron of the abbé and honoured him with an 'amitié naturelle et sincere'. The tone of the piece is rather amusing, for the abbé declares that he prefers to dedicate his work to M. de Chabannes than to 'quelque personne en place', who, it is implied, would be better able to reward him for it. But Lenglet assures us that his 'caractere libre et indépendant qui fait [ses] délices' would not allow him to fawn on courtiers, and, he adds, 'j'évite aussi par cette retenue de les fatiguer par ma présence'. Then follows a rather direct denial of respect for the hierarchical social structure:

Je cherche à cultiver, je cherche à estimer dans les personnes de mérite que j'ai le bonheur d'approcher, non des dignités qui leur sont étrangères, mais des qualités, qui leur appartiennent en propre [...]. Je suis frappé par des mœurs sages et douces, par une familiarité aimable et facile; par des sentiments de probité et d'honneur, qui s'attirent les applaudissemens publics.

We have, however, seen that in practice the abbé was not at all averse to soliciting the favour of persons in authority, irrespective of their personal qualities. It is not altogether surprising that the censor decided to suppress this dedication. Lenglet sent a copy to Passionei, and told him that only one other copy had been released - that which he gave to the Comtesse de Chabannes:²⁰⁵ this was not however true, for most copies of the work which I have seen do, in fact, contain this dedication.

In view of the sentiments expressed above, it is all the more extraordinary that Lenglet should, in fact, have decided to use his work to beg a reward from the King for the services he, Lenglet, felt he had rendered in 1721, and this by blatantly contravening the censorship laws. In the section devoted to contemporary history, from 1709 onwards, Lenglet continually made reference to his own role in the events of the day, or recounted anecdotes he had learned, as it were, on the field of battle. Many of his remarks were highly indiscreet, suggesting incompetence or foul-play on the part of representatives of the royal administration, for example in the conduct of the war.²⁰⁶

But most pointedly, under the year 1721, he related that:

Le Roi tomba dangereusement malade vers le milieu de l'année, et ce fut par les soins et l'attention des Medecins qu'il revint en santé [...]. L'inquiétude sur la conservation de ce jeune Prince, si cheri de la Nation, se saisit alors de tous les François, et principalement des Parisiens, jusqu'à déterminer un Particulier a partir de Paris au mois de Septembre, pour aller à Vienne en Autriche implorer l'assistance du vertueux Empereur Charles VI, auprès duquel il avoit un ami puissant. Il le fit prier [...] de vouloir bien prendre les mesures convenables pour concourir à conserver la personne d'un Prince, de la bonté naissante duquel la France et même l'Europe entiere avoient tout à esperer.²⁰⁷

Lenglet goes on to claim that he succeeded in his 'négociations', and then naively underlines his motivation in telling the story:

Ce zelé Citoyen revint ensuite à Paris, et comme un de ses amis lui demandoit quelles récompenses il esperoit de cette courageuse démarche? Il répondit: de deux sortes. J'ai déjà, dit-il, reçu la premiere, qui est très-réelle, par le sacrifice de huit à neuf mille livres, que j'ai dépensé, quoique je ne sois pas fort riche. Mais un Sujet fidele ne doit-il pas s'estimer heureux de sacrifier son bien pour le service de son Souverain? La seconde récompense, bien plus réelle que la premiere, me sera donnée en son tems; et j'espere la recevoir de celui qui est beaucoup plus puissant que le Prince que j'ai crû devoir servir alors; et qui est même plus exact et plus fidele à récompenser le bien, surtout un bien général, que l'on fait, ou que l'on procure par des vûes droites et dés-interressées.²⁰⁸

On 25th March 1754 Lenglet went to Versailles, and presented a copy of his work to the King: he probably gained admission through the Duc

d'Aumont, with whom he had had some previous connections, or the Duc de Fleury, both of whom he cites as witnesses.²⁰⁹ One report suggests that he had even somehow arranged to have the King's attention immediately drawn to the recital of his good offices.²¹⁰ The effects were not what he had hoped for, however, for that very evening an order was issued to halt all sales of the book,²¹¹ and the censor, the abbé Sallier, was summoned to Versailles. He reported that he had ordered the suppression of a large number of passages, which had been left intact in the copy presented to the King.²¹² Lenglet himself went to see Malesherbes on hearing of the suspension of sales; the Magistrate, always willing to help men of letters, had a long talk with the recalcitrant abbé, of which they each drafted rather different minutes.²¹³ Lenglet quickly learnt that the King had been upset by the suggestion that there had been an attempt made on his life in 1721. Lenglet tried to claim that he had only wished to show that all good citizens were deeply worried by the King's illness, but Malesherbes was not easily bluffed, as he made clear to the abbé:

Je lui ai dit que le passage qui a choqué tous ceux qui l'ont [lu] est très obscur en luy même, et que pour qu'il ait un sens tant soit peu raisonnable, il faut supposer qu'il existait de pareils desseins. En effet comment l'abbé Lenglet peut-il dire que son voyage à Vienne a sauvé la vie du Roi sans une supposition abominable.

As to the illegality of the publishing procedure, Lenglet assured the Magistrate that he had had all the copies corrected according to the censor's instructions, reserving only three in their original state, 'savoir un pour le Roy, un pour le Maréchal de Richelieu, et le troisième pour M. le Duc de Chevreuse',²¹⁴ which, needless to remark, was a blatant lie.²¹⁵ He even claimed that the abbé Sallier had agreed to this arrangement, which the censor denied. Malesherbes pointed out the absurdity of Lenglet's action in the administration's eyes:

Je lui ai répondu [...] que ce n'était point par la voie d'une impression clandestine qu'on demande la récompense de ses services,

but the abbé, in much aggrieved tones, assured him that he needed the testimony of print, for 'le service etant rendu on ne trouvait personne pour vous appuyer'. He had already tried three different avenues without success. He had, however, intended to return to Versailles in order to present a copy of the Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc to the King, along with a manuscript piece again detailing the 'services considérables' which he had rendered church and state in the course of his life.²¹⁶ He gave a copy of this, and one further extremely detailed 'Mémoire' to Malesherbes, hoping that the Magistrate could act on his behalf. His manuscript ended once again with a totally tactless naivety:

Il espère que S.M. le recompensera de ses services et de ses travaux. Elle accorde si libéralement ses graces à tant d'autres Ecclésiastiques, qui n'ont rien opéré pour l'Eglise, ni pour l'Etat, qu'il ose se flatter qu'elle voudra bien les répandre sur lui.²¹⁷

All Lenglet got for his pains, however, was an order issued by the Conseil d'Etat du Roi on 11th May, 1754, which declared 'le d. abbé Lenglet Dufresnoy déchu de tous les droits portés par le privilège à lui cédé par De Bure l'ainé', and ordered that all the sheets which did not conform with those signed by the censor should be 'mises au pilon'. The unfortunate printer Chardon, who was something of a scapegoat in the affair, was condemned to pay a 900 livres fine for contravening the publishing laws.²¹⁸ Lenglet finally got off very lightly, for he was allowed, probably tacitly, to continue the distribution of his book (in theory corrected) towards the end of the year.²¹⁹ He brazenly wrote to Passionei of a plan to reprint the offending material:

Je compte faire un petit détail des anecdotes de l'Histoire de France en question et que je ferai imprimer en Hollande. Il y aura du curieux.²²⁰

He did not, however, have time left to carry out his plan, or to publish

the remaining projected seven volumes of the work, for which much of the material was found in his papers after his death.²²¹

Thus, at eighty years of age, Lenglet was still actively seeking and hoping for some kind of church or state sinecure, in addition to the pension which he had held since 1718. He was leading a full and active life, and enjoyed good health, as he told Cardinal Passionei on 6th January 1755 when passing on to him some of his favourite cures.²²²

It was, then, sadly in an unfortunate accident that he lost his life on 15th January,²²³ of which Déon de Beaumont recounts the circumstances:

Il rentra chez lui sur les six heures du soir, et prit un Livre nouveau qu'on lui avoit envoyé; c'étoit les Considérations sur les Révolutions des Arts par M. l'Abbé de Méhégan; il en lut quelques pages, s'endormit, et tomba dans le feu. Ses voisins accoururent trop tard pour le secourir. Il avoit la tête presque toute brulée lorsqu'on le retira du feu. Le fatal volume qui étoit tombé en même temps dans la cheminée, n'avoit servi qu'à augmenter la flamme, et le supplice de notre martyr. Le Livre étoit presque tout consumé; il n'en restoit que quelques lambeaux qu'on enleva avec des pincettes; l'Approbation du Censeur subsistoit en entier; ce qui fit connoître l'ouvrage.²²⁴

He was buried in the church of Saint-Séverin, just a few yards from the apartment in the rue de la Harpe where he had spent the latter part of his life.²²⁵

On the 31st January the seals which had been placed on Lenglet's apartment were lifted, and his niece's husband, Jean Alexandre Thomas, proceeded with the taking of an inventory on behalf of the three heirs presumptive.²²⁵ Thomas' wife, Marie-Thérèse de Thienne, daughter of Lenglet's deceased sister Marie-Jeanne; Anne-Thérèse Lenglet, still a minor, daughter of the intriguing brother Jacques Lenglet de Percel, also deceased; and Lenglet's surviving sister Marguerite, to whom he had always been so close. There is no mention of the renegade Antoine,

who had probably already died in his prison in Picardy. Lists were made of the furniture, which was plentiful if mainly functional: bookshelves, desks and tables, some kitchen equipment, a large range of Turkish kettles, teapots and coffee-pots, which we may remember Lenglet was collecting in 1721. There were clay bowls, glass bottles and stills, and furnaces, the tools of his chemical/alchemical experimentation. The abbé's books and manuscripts were inventoried and priced by the libraire Coustelier; unfortunately the works were mainly grouped together under vague titles, so that we cannot accurately reconstitute Lenglet's library from the information given. It was not however very extensive; besides his own publications, he had mainly works of a bibliographical nature, useful for the book-trader: there were, for example, 50 volumes of 'Catalogues de Bibliothèque'. There were various miscellaneous works on history, alchemy, medicine; fascinating lots of small works, unfortunately unidentifiable, with descriptions such as '14 Brochures dont la chemise sanglante prisés 2 livres 8 sols', or '40 vols ou Brochures dont histoire d'une esclave prisé 4 livres', which may have been works of popular literature sold by the street colporteurs. The description of the manuscripts was just as vague: there were innumerable portfolios containing 'divers morceaux sur l'histoire', pieces on alchemy, and 'différentes recettes et remèdes'. Being largely undifferentiated, the manuscripts were estimated at a very low value. The entire stock was bought by two booksellers, who undoubtedly re-sold them at a large profit.²²⁷ When the abbé's estate had been duly estimated the heirs renounced the succession one after the other;²²⁸ one must assume that they found the debts on the estate to be greater than the assets in hand. The abbé's pleas for support from church and state had therefore been based on genuine need: whether he spent

his regular income on family commitments, or whether his publishing activities effectively drained, rather than contributed to his resources we cannot easily establish, but it is certain that at the end of a life whose contours had been largely shaped by economic pressures he died effectively penniless.

There were few public testimonies to his passing. We have already seen that the Encyclopédie paid him a rather restrained tribute; the only major obituary was the article researched and written by Déon de Beaumont for the Année littéraire to which I have referred many times.²²⁹

Although de Beaumont had consulted Lenglet's family and friends in drafting it, the article centred mainly around the works, the amount of information about his life being very limited. The tone was reasonably eulogious, and, at least, respectful.²³⁰ In private literary correspondences his death was, of course, also noted: I have already quoted Grimm's harsh judgement, which can, however, be counterpointed by Cardinal Passionei's more personal comment in a letter to Lacurne de Sainte-Palaye, which does express a sense of loss:

Cette [dernière] lettre m'a sensiblement affligé en m'apprenant la mort du pauvre abbé Lenglet que je regrette infiniment surtout par la triste fin qu'il a faite et la mort tragique qu'il a essuyée; je perds en lui un correspondant que je ne retrouverai plus, et j'ai lieu de le regretter à plus d'un titre.²³¹

In all, however, little public attention was paid to the passing of a man who had held no state or church office, belonged to no literary institution, and had clearly not achieved the status of a significant writer in the eyes of his contemporaries.

Notes to Chapter VI

1. See Bibliography, 51.01.
2. See Bibliography, 51.02.
3. See 'Avis du libraire' in Calendrier historique.
4. Parts of this manuscript may, however, have been incorporated into the Plan de l'histoire...de la monarchie française published in 1753.
5. See Bastille 11717, f.227, and notes from another file, the original of which I have not located, quoted by Barbier, Dictionnaire des ouvrages anonymes, 1, 478-9.
6. Barbier, ibid.
7. Bastille 11717, f.227.
8. James Edward Stuart (1688-1766) had, like his father, resided in Paris up to 1717, when he had to leave France as a result of the treaty signed between that country and England; he spent most of the rest of his life in Rome. Louis XV had allowed his son Charles ('Bonny Prince Charlie', 1721-88) to be recalled to Paris after the outbreak of the war with England in 1740, and in 1745 the young Stuart set out for Scotland on the advice of the Cardinal de Tencin. After a number of impressive initial victories at the head of the Scots clans, he was defeated by the English forces at Culloden in April 1746. In accordance with the terms of the treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle in 1748 he was expelled from France, and spent the rest of his life in relative obscurity in Italy. These devastating events were still fresh in the minds of the Stuart supporters when Lenglet published his Calendrier (cf. Biog.univers., xl, 351-4).
9. Cf., for example, Chapter III, p.112.
10. Vat.Lat.9813, f.12 (letter 18 Mar. 1754).
11. See the 'Avis de l'imprimeur'.
12. See Calendrier des princes, p.97.
13. Journal de Barbier, avocat au Parlement de Paris, Paris, Charpentier, 1866, p.411: the lawyer was clearly in no doubt that Lenglet was the author of the work, and a Lettre de M*** à M*** au sujet du Nouvel abrégé chronologique de l'histoire de l'Europe, n.p., n.d., also names Lenglet. A note by d'Hémery, Inspecteur de la librairie, quoted by A.A. Barbier, does state: 'C'est Gosford qui est l'auteur du 'Calendrier historique' pour lequel l'abbé Lenglet-Dufresnoy fut arrêté parce qu'il avait rendu le manuscrit à Leloup'

- (Dictionnaire des anonymes, i, 478-9), but in another file it is suggested that Gosford had only been used to procure the approbation and privilège, and that Lenglet was indeed the author (Bastille 11717, f.227). There may have been some collaboration in the actual writing of the work, but it seems highly probable that this was largely the abbé's responsibility.
14. E.-J.-F. Barbier tells us that the French government responded 'sur les plaintes et pour satisfaire l'ambassadeur d'Angleterre' (Journal, p.411).
 15. In remarking on the length of Lenglet's detention Barbier adds: 'Il auroit été plus naturel et plus juste d'y faire mettre le censeur, qui est l'abbé Sallier, homme très-distingué' (*ibid.*); the approbation normally afforded immunity from imprisonment to author and publisher (cf. Hanley, 'The policing of thought', Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, clxxxiii, 280).
 16. Arrêt du Conseil d'Etat du Roy, qui ordonne la suppression de deux calendriers nouvellement imprimés, etc., Paris, Imprimerie royale, 1750 (in Franç. 22092, f.149).
 17. The most reliable archival documents give 7 Jan. as the date of the order of arrest (see B.L., ms. Egerton 1667, f.38, 'Registre' from the original archives of the Bastille; Bastille 10880, f.254; and Nouv.acq.franç. 1891, f.467). One note gives 2 Jan. as the date of arrest and detention in Fort l'Evêque, which is highly unlikely (Bastille 11717, f.227, of which there is a copy in Nouv. acq.franç. 1891, f.463).
 18. Cf. Journal de Barbier, p.411; the date given for Leloup's release in Bastille 11717, f.227 is Jan. 12, but since this document erroneously gives 2 Jan. as the date of arrest, the evidence is not reliable.
 19. Note quoted by A.A. Barbier, Dictionnaire des ouvrages anonymes, i, 479; see also Bastille 11717, f.227.
 20. Bastille 11717, f.227.
 21. Ibid., f.229.
 22. See letter 1 Jan. 1752, where Lenglet writes to his sister: 'Ne vous donnez aucun mouvement pour moi, je vous en supplie, je sais la peine que vous avez eue, il y a 2 ans' (Ravaisson, Archives de la Bastille, xii, 374).
 23. Cf. letter from Lenglet to Passionei (27 Apr. 1750) where he mentions a visit he paid to the Comte to offer his thanks (Piancastelli, f.718).
 24. See Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, ms. 14565 (Livre de sortie) under date 24 Mar. 1750; also Bastille 12564, and 10880, f.254.
 25. Lettre de M*** à M***, au sujet du Nouvel abrégé chronologique de l'histoire de l'Europe, n.p., n.d.

26. Cf. above Chapter V, pp.341-2.
27. Cf. for example Chapter V, pp.348-9 above, re the 'Mémoire' on Seckendorff which Lenglet sent to the Comte d'Argenson.
28. Delort, Détention des philosophes, p.101.
29. See Alfred Cobban, A History of modern France, London, Penguin, 1972, i, 61.
30. Lenglet wrote to Passionei shortly after his release from prison in Apr. 1750: 'Comme M. le Comte d'Argenson avoit travaillé pour ma liberté je l'ai été remercié et nous avons renoué connoissance. Il y avoit bien 6 ans que je ne l'avois vû' (Piancastelli, f.718).
31. See Franç. 22109, f.34, published by Delort, Détention des philosophes, pp.85-92, but with one paragraph missing.
32. Delort, op.cit., p.85.
33. Ibid., p.87.
34. Ibid., pp.88-9.
35. Ibid., p.92.
36. This paragraph is included in Franç. 22109, f.34, but not in the version published by Delort who recounts the anecdote (op.cit., p.93).
37. See Franç. 22109, f.34, where d'Hémery gives 1 Sep. 1751 as the date of his discovery.
38. See these reports in Delort, op.cit., pp.93-8.
39. See 'Registre', B.L., ms. Egerton 1667; also Bastille 11754, f.276, and 12565, where the 'date d'entrée' is confused with the date of the order. Cf. Delort, op.cit., p.99 and Ravaisson, op.cit., xii, 375.
40. Delort, op.cit., p.99.
41. Rollin cannot have felt very friendly towards the abbé since the incident in 1743 when Lenglet betrayed his identity as publisher of the Supplément aux Mémoires de Condé (see Chapter V, p.313).
42. Delort, op.cit., p.102.
43. Ibid., p.104.
44. Bastille 10880, ff.271-2, published in Ravaisson, op.cit., xii, 374.
45. Cf. Chapter V above, p. 284 ; Lenglet also wrote of her welfare in a 'Mémoire' to Berryer (Bastille 10880, f.272).

46. See letters 1 Jan. (Ravaillon, op.cit., xii, 373-4), and 14 Jan. (Delort, op.cit., pp.105-8).
47. See Delort, op.cit., pp.108-9.
48. Ibid., p.109.
49. See Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, ms. 14565 under this date, and Delort, op.cit., p.110, who quotes from the 'Livre des sorties'; but another register (Bastille 12565) gives 17 Jan. as the date of release.
50. Cf. Louis Cognet, Le Jansénisme, Paris, P.U.F., 1975, pp.110-11.
51. Re Passionei and his connections with Jansenist and Gallican circles see Gossman, Medievalism and the ideologies of the Enlightenment, pp.81 ff.
52. Vat.Lat.9813, f.8 (letter 4 Mar. 1754); we find Lenglet again recommending this course of action at a later date, the problem still not having been fully resolved: 'Je proposerai à quelques prélats pacifiques de prendre la permission du Roy pour consulter le St Siège' (ibid., f.64, letter 23 Dec. 1754).
53. Ibid., f.15 (22 Apr.); Lenglet did, in fact, actually send a 'Mémoire' to Passionei 'sur les affaires de l'Eglise' (see Vat. Lat.9813, f.16, 20 May 1754), which he later asks the Cardinal to copy and return to him, as the Cardinal de Soubise and the Archevêque de Sens have asked to see it (ibid., f.39, 26 Aug.).
54. Ibid., f.9; see also f.44.
55. Lenglet wrote to Passionei: 'L'on me conseilla de la part du ministre de rompre mes correspondances avec les Pays Etrangers. Vous savez qu'un conseil et un ordre de la part du ministre sont le même chose' (ibid., f.8, 4 Mar.).
56. See, for e.g., ibid., f.34: 'J'ai toujours dit, comme je le dis encore que le Roi est redevable de la Couronne au Parlement de Paris [...] M. le Maréchal de Noailles a dit fort sagement, s'il n'y a plus de Parlement, il n'y a plus de Roy en France'.
57. Ibid., f.14 (22 Apr. 1754).
58. Ibid., f.34.
59. Ibid., f.41.
60. Ibid., f.61 (9 Dec. 1754).
61. He tells Passionei: 'Je suis très favorablement reçu dans cette maison' (ibid., f.12).

62. Ibid.
63. Ibid., f.55.
64. Cf. ibid., ff.12-13 and f.55. Lenglet was teaching Italian to the Archbishop in preparation for his expected visit to Rome (ibid., f.50).
65. See Bibliography, 53.01.
66. Cf. above Chapter V, pp.299-300.
67. See Cours de chimie, i, p.ix, where Lenglet states that he had formerly attended the classes of M. Malouin, now royal censor of books on chemistry.
68. Vat.Lat.9813, ff.69-70.
69. According to Michault (Mémoires, p.193) the material in vols. IV and V is drawn from Ethmuller and other German, Italian and French writers, which Lenglet had simply compiled.
70. See L'Année littéraire, iii(1755), pp.130-1; also in Michault, Mémoires, p.53.
71. Cf. Chapter V, p.301 re Malouin and the Encyclopédie.
72. Those with a title-page in the name of the bookseller Rollin: see Bibliography.
73. See Bibliography, 54.01; the original edition was entitled Arte de los metales en que se enseña el verdadero beneficio de los oro, y plata por açogue, Madrid, del Reyno, 1640.
74. Traité de l'art métallique, extrait des oeuvres d'Alvare Alfonse Barba, Paris, Saugrain père, 1730.
75. Jacques Proust, Diderot et l'Encyclopédie, Paris, Colin, 1967, p.178.
76. Cf. Métallurgie, ii, 264.
77. Cf. Barbier (Dictionnaire des anonymes, ii, 287), who remarks that 'Gosford [...] trace avec trop d'exactitude l'histoire de la famille des Grassins, pour qu'on ne le considère pas comme un Français qui cherche en vain à se déguiser sous un nom emprunté'.
78. See Métallurgie, i, p.xxxviii of the Preface, where there is a reference to a conversation with Garelli in Vienna in 1722, and which clearly identifies Lenglet as the author.
79. Mémoires de Trévoux, Feb. 1752, p.366.
80. La Bigarure, ou gazette galante, xii(1751), 116.

81. See Chapter I, pp.16 ff.
82. See Preface to the Traité des apparitions (i, pp.i-ii), and Chapter I above, pp.27-30.
83. Traité des apparitions, i, p.ii.
84. Cf. the discussion in Chapter I above, p.28.
85. See Traité des apparitions, ii, 199-229; Lenglet has added new notes to his original text.
86. Ibid., p.33.
87. Cf. ibid.
88. Ibid., i, 384-408.
89. De Servorum Dei [...] canonisatione was published in Bologna in 1734-8. Re Benedict XIV cf. Gossman, Medievalism and the ideologies of the Enlightenment, pp.73-4.
90. Lenglet wrote: 'Je l'ai revû et me suis servi pour le fortifier de cinq chapitres excellens qui sont dans le livre si savant de Sa Sainteté sur la Canonisation des Saints' (Piancastelli, f.620).
91. At a slightly later date he was more specific, stating that: 'Mon livre a été ici approuvé par trois Docteurs de Sorbonne avec applaudissement. Mons. le Chancelier lui même la voulu lire, il m'a fait quelques remarques que j'ai suivies et pour les distinguer je les ay mises en rouge' (ibid., f.637, letter 2 Sep. 1748).
92. Ibid., ff.623-4. In a letter of 2 Sep. he mentions the reason for his failure to publish in Paris: 'Mon ouvrage cependant n'a pu paroître parce que M. le Chancelier a eu le malheur de confier la librairie à un petit f...n de maître de Requetes, qui pour se vanger de moy a empêché ce magistrat de m'accorder un privilege; et cela parce que je lui ai lavé la tête d'importance pour deux dementis qu'il eut la temerité de me donner et sur les quels il fut convaincu sur le champ qu'il avoit tort' (ibid., f.638). The Directeur de la librairie at this time was M. Maboul; like all his predecessors since 1722, he was indeed a maître des requêtes (cf. Jean-Paul Belin, Le Commerce des livres prohibés à Paris de 1750 à 1789, New York, Burt Franklin [Paris, Belin, 1918], p.120).
93. Piancastelli, ff.636-7.
94. See letter 28 Apr. 1749, ibid., ff.644-5. A favourable response to Chapter XI did, in fact, reach Lenglet around this time; on 7 Oct. 1748 he wrote to Passionei: 'J'ai la satisfaction de voir que V.E. approuve mon chapitre XIe' (See Fichier Charavay, B.N., Dept. des mss.).
95. Piancastelli, f.663: the letter from the Pope is not included in

any copies I have seen. Michault gives a slightly different account of the manuscript's fate, stating that: 'Lenglet le fit passer d'Avignon à Rome, pour le remettre au Pape, qui le lut, et l'approuva verbalement. Il fit dire à l'auteur qu'il alloit donner ses ordres dans cette ville pour en permettre l'impression. Il avoit fait traduire en Italien l'onzième Chapitre, qui regarde Marie d'Agréda. Le Manuscrit revint en France. M. le Chancelier d'Aguesseau le vit; et il fut enfin permis à l'Auteur de le faire imprimer secrettement, c'est-à-dire, sans Privilège' (Mémoires, p.133N). Whether the suggestion of publishing in Rome really came from the Vatican, or was instigated by Lenglet, we cannot be sure.

96. Piancastelli, ff.717-8.
97. Cf. Bibliography.
98. Re the permissions tacites cf. Chapter V above, p.308.
99. Friedrich Melchior Grimm, et al., Correspondance littéraire, Paris, Garnier, 1877-82, ii, 50. The appearance of the Traité was simply noted by the Bibliothèque impartiale, iv(1751), Part I, p.151.
100. See the fourth edition of his Traité sur les apparitions des esprits et sur les vampires, Paris, de Bure, 1751, 2 vols. See also Josephus de Amaletus, Epistolae ad virum clarissimum DN. Nicolaum Lenglet Du Fresnoy abbatem et theologum parisiensem, Verona, 1755, 183pp., which discusses the Marie d'Agréda affair.
101. Calmet, Traité, ii, 474.
102. Ibid., pp.476-7.
103. Ibid., pp.477-8.
104. Ibid., p.479.
105. Ibid., p.482.
106. Ibid., p.477.
107. In the 'Avertissement' to his Recueil de dissertations sur les apparitions Lenglet declares: 'On a placé quelques notes en ma faveur sous le texte de la lettre du R.P. Dom Calmet mais je n'y ai eu aucune part. J'ai su qu'elles viennent de M. l'Abbé Le Mascrier personne d'un grand savoir et d'un vrai mérite, qui a eu soin de cette Edition, et qui les a faites sans ma participation. Je lui en ai cependant beaucoup d'obligation' (i, p.clxii).
108. Mémoires, p.135.
109. See Bibliography, 56.01. Notices on the edition appeared in the Mémoires de Trévoux, June 1752, p.1535, and the Bibliothèque impartiale, vi(1752), Part I, p.285.

110. Recueil, i, pp.lxx-xxi.
111. One is reminded of the application he had made of similar rules to biblical stories in the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire.
112. Recueil, i, pp.xxxv-vi. The terms which Lenglet employs in this Preface are very close to those used in the Encyclopédie article on 'Apparitions', which implies that such phenomena are confined to '[des] cerveaux échauffés' and 'les esprits timides et crédules' (L'Encyclopédie, i, 546). Cf. Kay Wilkins, 'The Treatment of the supernatural in the Encyclopédie', Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, xc, 1757-71.
113. Mémoires de Trévoux, Oct. 1752, p.2485.
114. Mémoires, pp.136-7. The essay by Meyer is in vol.ii, Part I, pp.179 ff.
115. See Antoine Gachet d'Artigny, Nouveaux mémoires d'histoire, de critique et de littérature, vii (1756), 178.
116. See d'Artigny's account in ibid., p.177.
117. See, for e.g., Mémoires de Trévoux, Oct. 1752, p.2485.
118. Mémoires, p.139.
119. Piancastelli, f.639.
120. Cf. Bibliography re two different versions of the title-page.
121. See letter to Passionei, Vat.Lat.9813, ff.8-9 (4 Mar. 1754), and f.10.
122. I have not found any such corrected copies.
123. Letter 22 Apr. 1754, Vat.Lat.9813, f.10.
124. See ibid., f.20 (3 June 1754).
125. Ibid., ff.47-8.
126. This is the expression used by Diderot in praise of Turgot in the article 'Coton' (Encyclopédie, iv, 306); cf. Jacques Proust, L'Encyclopédie, Paris, Colin, 1965, p.92.
127. See the manuscript 'Registres' from the Bibliothèque du Roi, in B.N., Hémicycle.
128. Edme Mallet (1713-55) became Professeur de Théologie at the Collège de Navarre in 1751, and was subsequently nominated chanoine despite a denunciation which appeared in the Gazette ecclésiastique on the subject of his collaboration with the Encyclopédie (cf. Proust, Diderot et l'Encyclopédie, p.523). In addition to his work in theology he wrote on a variety of subjects such as history, oratory, and poetry. His éloge follows that of

Lenglet in vol.vi of the Encyclopédie, where d'Alembert's tone of respect is in marked contrast to that of his piece on Lenglet.

129. Cf. Proust, L'Encyclopédie, pp.28-9.
130. See ibid., p.101.
131. See L'Encyclopédie, i, p.xli, and cf. John Lough, The Contributors to the Encyclopédie, London, Grant and Cutler, 1973, p.45.
132. L'Encyclopédie, iii, p.xv.
133. For details of this period in the publishing of the Encyclopédie see Proust, L'Encyclopédie, pp.52-7 and 86-7.
134. Vol. vi, pp.ii-iii.
135. See Proust, L'Encyclopédie, pp.89-90, and Lough, op.cit., p.50.
136. The articles are signed (a), which is identified as Lenglet's mark at the beginning of vol.iii. Cf. R.N. Schwab. W.E. Rex and J. Lough, Inventory of Diderot's Encyclopédie, (Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, lxxx and lxxxiii), 1971.
137. L'Encyclopédie, iii, 84.
138. Ibid., iv, 1020.
139. Ibid., p.1024.
140. See Dom René Tassin and Dom C.F. Toustain, Nouveau traité de diplomatique, Paris, 1750-65, ii, p.iv.
141. L'Encyclopédie, vi, p.iii.
142. See Denis Diderot, Correspondance, ed. Georges Roth, Paris, Editions de minuit, i, 195-6, letter almost certainly addressed to Le Breton, publisher of the Encyclopédie: 'Il serait bien fâcheux que ce scellé de l'abbé Lenglet différât beaucoup à se lever. Ne soiez point inquiet de trouver quelqu'un qui supplée à l'abbé du Fresnoy; je le ferai... Aiez les papiers de l'abbé Lenglet. Je m'en charge. Voilà qui est dit'.
143. Minutier XCV, 238, 31 Jan. 1755. Lenglet had once contemplated having part of his Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc printed 'chez M. le Breton mon voysin'.
144. These were undoubtedly for the projected 4° edition: see below, pp.423-4.
145. Cf. below, p.432.
146. L'Encyclopédie, vi, p.iii.
147. See Edward Gibbon, Memoirs of my life, ed. Bonnard, London, Nelson, 1966, p.99.

148. The Enlightenment. An interpretation, London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1967, i, 360.
149. Grimm, Correspondance littéraire, ii, 224.
150. Questions sur l'Encyclopédie, n.p., 1770-2, vii, 24-5. Voltaire was not always so harsh, however, for he did once describe Lenglet's Tables chronologiques as 'excellentes' in a letter to the Marquis d'Argenson (Voltaire, Correspondence, D.2802).
151. See Nouveaux mémoires d'histoire, de critique et de littérature, vii(1756), 323-52.
152. The manuscript is in the B.N., Franç. 10448, 4 vols. in-fol. It was edited by P. Dunand under the title La Première histoire en date de Jeanne d'Arc (1625-30). Histoire de la Pucelle d'Orléans, par Edmond Richer, Paris, Desclée, 1911-12, 2 vols.
153. No doubt this was Jean Lévesque de Burigny (1692-1785), one of a family of three scholarly brothers; he had formerly worked with Sainte-Hyacinthe in Holland on L'Europe savante, and he was to become a member of the Académie des Inscriptions in 1756. He published a large number of works of erudition, the most important of which was the Histoire de la philosophie payenne (1724) which had initially been attributed to Lenglet (Biog.univers., vi, 189-90).
154. D'Artigny, Nouveaux mémoires, vii, 326.
155. Ibid., p.327.
156. Cf. Lenglet's title-page (Bibliography, 58.01); it was in fact Richer who had based his work on the original manuscripts.
157. These include, in addition to the royal library, the library of the Chapitre de Paris, the Bibliothèque de Saint Victor, and private collections such as that of 'M. de Cotte, l'un des Présidents de la seconde chambre des Requêtes du Parlement de Paris', or that of the deceased Cardinal de Rohan (Preface, Part I). In his bibliography Lenglet even claims to have searched for copies of a rare work in Spanish in the libraries of a number of Spaniards, presumably resident in Paris (Part II, p.194).
158. Journal des savants, Nov. 1753, p.747.
159. Lenglet actually comments on this aspect of Richer's Histoire in his Part III, p.204, without admitting the use he has made of the work; he categorises Richer's treatise among those which are based on a belief in the direct intervention of god in the Pucelle's life, which belief he qualifies as 'un autre fanatisme'.
160. See, for example, Jeanne d'Arc, i, 75 and 120.
161. Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, xc, 1669-70.
162. Amsterdam, Aux dépens de la compagnie, 1735, pp.216-36.
163. Jeanne d'Arc, i, p.vii. This does not, however, prevent him from once again quoting the du Haillan passage in Part II of this work (pp.171 ff).

164. Ibid., i, p.ix.
165. Ibid., pp.x-xi.
166. Ibid., p.xi.
167. Ibid., iii, 204.
168. Ibid., p.217.
169. Ibid.
170. M. Vercruysse, in his article, fails to take account of Lenglet's exposé, and erroneously attributes the authorship of this 'physiological' theory to Claude Villaret in his Histoire de France (1765-70): see op.cit., p.1685.
171. Jeanne d'Arc, iii, 220-1.
172. Ibid., p.221.
173. Nouv.acq.franç. 3344, f.43 (autograph). The 'Mémoire' is not dated, but must have been written after the death of Denis François Secousse in 1754 to which Lenglet refers.
174. See the names on the title-page: Bibliography, 58.01. Distribution was well under way in July 1753 when Lenglet sent bound presentation copies to a correspondent in Orléans (ms. letters to M. Polluche, 5 and 13 July 1753, in Jeanne d'Arc Collection, Butler Library, Columbia University, New York). Interestingly, Lenglet asked Polluche to present the nine copies to the dignitaries of the town, and to the 'Bibliothèque publique', in his own name, as the abbé 'ne craint rien tant que les complimens et les remercimens'. Presumably such presents acted as a kind of advertising promotion.
175. See Bibliography; Lenglet also sent '25 affiches' to be posted up in the city of Orléans (Jeanne d'Arc Collection, letter 5 July 1753). De Villeneuve never in fact sold his copies, and Lenglet eventually took them back for sale to Holland (Nouv.acq.franç. 3344, f.43).
176. Nouv.acq.franç. 3344, f.43. Curiously, there were '3 rames environ de différentes parties de la Pucelle d'Orléans 12° rongés au Ver' found in Lenglet's apartment after his death: these were probably sheets which had been unusable because of the damage. They were valued at 9 livres in the 'Inventaire' after his death, presumably to be recycled.
177. Lenglet was negotiating with de Villeneuve for the printing of Part III early in July 1753 (letter 13 July, Jeanne d'Arc Collection): this was to be distributed free to those who had bought Parts I and II. He was even contemplating a possible Part IV 'ou seront plusieurs depositions important du Duc d'Alençon, du

- Comte de Dunois et autres au nombre de neuf et si deux traitez que j'ai trouvé dans les mss. de Dupui chez M. le Procureur general en valent la peine je les y mettrai' (letter to Polluche, 5 July 1753, Jeanne d'Arc Collection).
178. See 'Mémoire', f.43.
 179. Ibid. Cf. letter to Polluche, 26 Nov. 1753, where Lenglet asks that de Villeneuve send him back the unprinted copy: 'je le prie instamment de me renvoyer ma copie et de marquer l'endroit où il en est resté afin que je fasse ici achever le tout chez M. Le Breton mon voysin qui a le meme caractere fondu par M. Fournier le Jeune' (Bibliothèque municipale de Rouen, ms. Collection Duputel, Cartons V-VI, no.698). But de Villeneuve evidently chose to press on with the work, and on 30 Jan. 1754 Lenglet wrote to Polluche 'Dans l'esperance que la 3e partie de la Pucelle est finie' (Jeanne d'Arc Collection); on 3 Apr. he had still not received the 960 copies he was expecting (B.N., Dept. des ms., Fichier Charavay, letter to Polluche), but they must have been sent out within weeks of this letter along with the 'grandes affiches' to advertise the work in Paris, which were mentioned by Polluche in his notes on Lenglet's letter of 30 Jan. 1754 (Jeanne d'Arc Collection).
 180. See 'Mémoire', Nouv.acq.franç. 3344, f.43; in any case the law dictated that all packets of books printed abroad or in the provinces must be sent to the Chambre syndicale, where they were examined by specially appointed officers to ensure that the publishing laws had been respected (see Belin, Le Commerce des livres prohibés, p.56).
 181. This was, no doubt, the new édition of Samuel Freiherr von Puffendorff's Introduction à l'histoire moderne, générale et politique de l'univers, published in Paris by Mérigot in 1753-9.
 182. Jeanne d'Arc Collection. A period of 10 months elapsed, therefore, between the commencement of the printing of Part III, and Lenglet's receipt of the copies.
 183. Letter 22 July 1754, Vat.Lat.9813, f.30.
 184. Letter 30 Jan. 1754 (Jeanne d'Arc Collection). He was interested in the 'grand raisin d'Angouleme', the 'grand raisin de Limoge', both 'fin' and 'double', and also the 'grand Jesus fin'.
 185. We have already noted Lenglet's keen interest in the material presentation of his books; he put great emphasis on this in the Prospectus to his work, where he declared that the finest Dutch paper would be used for the subscription copies (Prospectus, p.8). He also commented on the fact that the booksellers often refused to use the better quality papers, which presumably were not commercially profitable (ibid., p.7).

186. See letter 'mercredi des cendres 1754', Jeanne d'Arc Collection. Lenglet continually makes contradictory statements regarding the relative cost factors in Paris and Orléans, presumably to 'hide his hand' from the booksellers involved.
187. See Bibliography, 58.02.
188. Prospectus, p.1.
189. Ibid., p.8.
190. Minutier XCV, 238, 'Inventaire 31 Jan. 1755'.
91. See letters Vat.Lat.9813, f.44 (9 Sep. 1754); f.60 (2 Dec. 1754); and ff.68-9 (6 Jan. 1755). Cf. Gossman, Medievalism, pp. 83-5 re Passionei and his often rather ungenerous responses to requests for aid.
92. Prospectus, pp.6-7.
93. The Society for the Encouragement of Learning began with a membership of over 100, including noblemen and scholars of the highest rank. The Society was to bear the expense of printing the works offered to it, taking a share of the profits, but allowing the authors to retain their copyright. Having failed to carry out its own printing, in 1742 the Society had recourse to the booksellers to act on its behalf. Retail booksellers were appointed, and allowed 15% on all the Society's publications which they sold. Although the Society did succeed in publishing a number of works, the odds against their financial success were too great, and it was dissolved in 1748: see F. A. Mumby and Ian Norrie, Publishing and bookselling, London, Jonathan Cape, 1974, pp.152-3, and Marjorie Plant, The English book-trade, London, Allen and Unwin, 1974, pp.223-4.
194. See 'Inventaire 31 Jan. 1755', Minutier XCV, 238.
195. Mémoires de Trévoux, 'Notice', Aug. 1753, p.1527; Oct. 1753, pp.2480-3; August 1754, pp. 2101-2.
196. Année littéraire, i(1754), pp.217-27.
197. Bibliothèque impartiale, ix(1754), p.364, [review pp.363-78]. M. Vercruysse holds that this critic 'n'a pas bien saisi la pensée de Du Fresnoy', i.e. a belief in the guiding hand of Providence, a conclusion which, as I. have shown, takes Lenglet too much at face value (see Vercruysse, 'Jeanne d'Arc au siècle des Lumières', Studies on Voltaire, xc, 1671).
198. Journal des savants, Nov. 1753, p.747.
199. See Bibliography, 59.01.
200. Plan de l'histoire, i, Préface.
201. See the Journal des savants, Nov. 1754, pp.733-6; L'Année littéraire, i(1755), 335-48.

202. See, for example, the direct comparison of specific passages made by the Journal des savants, p.736.
203. The journalist in the Journal des savants commented: 'Nous ne sçaurions trop nous élever contre l'exécution typographique de ce Livre: le caractère en est mauvais ainsi que le papier, et on trouve presque à chaque page des fautes d'orthographe ou des omissions impardonnables, qui fatiguent ou rebutent le Lecteur le moins délicat' (p.736).
204. See approbation and privilège at the back of vol.i, and also Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc, vol.i.
205. Letter 7 Oct. 1754, Vat.Lat.9813, f.48.
206. A friend of Lenglet's, M. de Longuemarre, in a letter to Déon de Beaumont, his biographer, written shortly after the abbé's death, indicates the importance that Lenglet attached to these pieces, and his awareness of their unorthodoxy: 'Je ne connois son histoire de France que par quelques fragments qu'il m'en a lus avant l'impression[.] Vous trouverez dans les cartons de cet ouvrage plusieurs traits qui lui sont personnels. Tels sont la découverte de la conspiration du Prince Cellamard et les moyens dont il se servit pour faire sortir M. le Blanc, son intime ami, de la Bastille. Il en est cependant quelques uns qu'il ne seroit pas prudent de rappeler au cas qu'il les ait fait imprimer. Je ne sçais ces anecdotes que par les lectures qu'il m'a faites dans le tems qu'il travailloit à cet ouvrage. Il m'en avoit promis un exemplaire avec les cartons, mais sa mort inopinée m'a privé de l'effet de ses promesses' (Letter dated 25 Apr. 1755, in Bibliothèque de Tonnerre, ms. 46-70, vol.5).
207. Plan de l'histoire, iii, 365-6 (cancellandum: i.e. original pages intended to be excised and replaced). Cf. Bibliography re the cancelled pages, and cf. Chapter III above, pp.19 ff. on this episode in Lenglet's life.
208. Ibid., pp.366-7, cancellanda.
209. See Nouv.acq.franç. 3344, ff.71 and 72, also ff.45-6.
210. Ibid., f.54.
211. Ibid., f.71.
212. See ibid., f.72; a list of the corrections ordered by Sallier is given on f.41.
213. The visit took place on the 28 Mar. 1754: see Lenglet's 'Mémoire' recording the visit, which he transmitted to Malesherbes (Nouv. acq.franç. 3344, f.45), and the latter's notes on it (ibid., f.54): my account of the affair is based on these two documents.
214. Lenglet was acquainted with both of these nobles, whom he mentions in letters to Passionei: see Vat.Lat.9813, f.12 re the de Luynes/Chevreuse family, and ff.56 and 57 where Lenglet says that 'M. le Maréchal de Richelieu [..] a beaucoup de bonté pour moi'.

215. See Bibliography.
216. See Nouv. acq. franç. 3344, f.47, and also ff.48-53.
217. Ibid., f.47.
218. In some of the manuscripts the figure given is 900 livres (ibid., ff.37 and 39). In others it appears to be 500 (ibid., ff.42 and 367): there may possibly have been two separate fines imposed on him. Malesherbes, with his usual kindness, managed to secure a three-month stay of execution for the payment of the fine.
219. Lenglet sent a copy (uncorrected) to Passionei in Oct. 1754 (Vat.Lat.9813, f.48); the reviews date from c. November onwards. See Bibliography re the number of uncorrected copies I have seen.
220. Letter 7 Oct. 1754, Vat.Lat.9813, f.48.
221. See Michault, Mémoires, p.148.
222. Vat.Lat.9813, ff.69-70; cf. above Chapter V, p.299, and p.398.
223. This is the date given in the 'Inventaire après décès', and also by Dreux du Radier, who knew Lenglet personally, and was one of the rare biographers to give his place of birth correctly (L'Europe illustrée, Paris, Odieuvre, 1765, v). The Année littéraire, however, gave 16 Jan. as the date of death (iii(1755), 138), which may have been simply a misprint, and in this was followed by Michault and subsequent biographers.
224. L'Année littéraire, loc.cit., 138-9. Michault follows this account closely (Mémoires, p.48), but Grimm in his Correspondance littéraire claims that Lenglet died looking for the Philosopher's Stone, étouffé sur ses fourneaux' (ii, 224); this smacks somewhat of sensationalism with which to regale his readers.
225. See L'Année littéraire, loc.cit., p.139.
226. See 'Inventaire', dated 31 Jan. 1755, Minutier XCV, 238.
227. A friend of Lenglet's had lent him a number of manuscripts prior to his death, which were sold with the other material found in the abbé's flat. De Longuemarre eventually discovered that 'le Sr Le Roy Libraire', one of the two booksellers who had acquired the Lenglet material, held his manuscripts, and he bought them back 'quoique cher' (see correspondence between Déon de Beaumont and de Longuemarre in Bibliothèque de Tonnerre, ms. 46-70, vols. 5-7, April-June 1755).
228. See Minutier XCV, 239: 1 Mar., 'Renonciation' by Marguerite Lenglet, veuve de la Barre; 4 Mar., 'Renonciation' by Anne-Marie Johnstone on behalf of her daughter Anne-Thérèse Lenglet; 15 Mar. 'Renonciation' by Marie-Thérèse de Thienne, épouse Thomas.

229. iii (1755), pp.116-39.

230. It was six years later that J.-B. Michault published his Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la vie et des ouvrages de Monsieur l'abbé Lenglet du Fresnoy; he based much of his biographical account on the work of de Beaumont, but added a great deal of useful information in his comprehensive bibliography. Given the distance in time since the death, and the difference in origins and outlook between this Burgundian scholar and the abbé, he is understandably far more critical in his approach to the character than was de Beaumont.

231. B.N., ms. Collection Moreau 1569, f.7 (letter 19 Feb. 1755).

Conclusion

In following closely the life and works of the abbé Nicolas Lenglet-Dufresnoy, we have been continually obliged to suspend or to revise our judgement of this complex, and often baffling character. In his personal relationships we have occasionally been able to admire qualities of fidelity, as in the affection and concern he expressed in his latter days for the woman who had kept his house for many years, or indeed for his sister Marguerite with whom there was a close bond to the end. But such glimpses of a warm and kindly man within a restricted circle are darkly overshadowed by other manifestations such as the innumerable incidences of personal spite and vindictiveness which we have witnessed on Lenglet's part, whether directed against an obscure M. Desqueux, or more prominent personages such as J.-B. Rousseau or the abbé Prévost. Looking back on his life there can be no escaping the conclusion that Lenglet's public character was deeply marked by inconsistency, dishonesty and cynicism.

We have found this inconsistency in all areas of the abbé's life and works. That it can partly be attributed to inherent traits of personality is undeniable; quick-tongued and hot-headed, the abbé was a man of action rather than of reflection, which characteristic he shared with his two brothers. We have seen how dearly he loved to feel that he was close to the centre of political life, and his taste for intrigue on a grand scale: he seems to have rushed headlong into new schemes without considering the long-term consequences for his career. His works were expedited with the same haste: d'Alembert was only one

of many to remark that 'Il écrivoit comme il parloit, avec beaucoup de rapidité, et par cette raison il paroissoit mieux parler qu'il n'écrivoit'. To this trait we can therefore assign some of the blame for his careless, often ugly style of writing, as well as for the innumerable errors which mar almost all his works, and which led the scholarly Président Bouhier to suggest facetiously, as early as 1725, that the abbé Le Clerc should compile a 'recueil des Bévues littéraires de M. Frenoy'.¹

But there are other factors which help to explain those continual shifts of opinion, be it in relation to persons, institutions or ideas, which are so disconcerting for the reader of his works. Chief among these must be his ambiguous position in society. Lenglet-Dufresnoy was an ordained priest; up to the age of 30 he had devoted himself to the study of theology in preparation for his life as a cleric. Much in his education was distasteful to him on intellectual grounds; we have seen his condemnations of the teaching offered by the Sorbonne, and the rationalistic and critical approach which he adopted as a young student in reaction against such a tradition. Yet he persevered in the path which he had chosen, undoubtedly, like so many of his contemporaries who had no personal fortune, in the hope that it would give him access to a position in society which he could deem to be preferable to the solid, but irretrievably bourgeois security of his tradesman father. Diderot could not betray himself and his ambitions when that same choice was put to him, and rejected both alternatives to forge his own difficult and independent course through life. When Lenglet accepted the garb of the cleric he effectively committed himself to a life of duplicity and subterfuge; we have seen on innumerable occasions how the critics, especially those of the Mémoires de Trévoux, called attention to the

incompatibility between his work and his clerical calling, and how near they sometimes came to bringing the wrath of the authorities down on the abbé's head. He seems to have revelled in the ironies of his own situation; we may recall the remarks made by one of the characters in his Preface to the Oeuvres de Marot (1731) on the subject of his unorthodox reading matter: he camouflaged the books in his locked bookshelves under innocuous titles, thus ensuring that anyone who glanced at the volumes would see nothing but the most elevating collection of pious manuals. He concluded that this was 'un des moyens les plus surs pour éviter ces accusations dogmatiques, toujours fâcheuses en quelque situation que l'on soit'.² This anecdote may be taken on a metaphoric as well as on a literal level, for it closely fits Lenglet's identity as a writer: the misleading titles of his books often hid much that one might not have expected to find there.

Some of the contradictions within Lenglet's oeuvre are evident from a glance at the Bibliography: an edition of Le Moyen de parvenir counterpoints L'Imitation de Jésus-Christ, and we can turn from Le Cabinet satyrique to La Messe des fidèles. And such an extraordinary diversity is not typical only of the earlier part of the abbé's literary life: it continues to the very end, just as his hopes of being offered a church benefice persist right into the 1750 s, as we saw from his correspondence with Passionei. His aspiration towards a position within the church or state, pathetically mistaken as it was, nonetheless dictated to a certain extent the contours of the abbé's publishing history. At one extreme he indulged his taste for the unorthodox, the irreverent, even the obscene in works published anonymously outside France, or secretly within; but he publicly associated himself, at the other end of the spectrum, with uncontroversial works of religion and piety which

he could sign as a 'prêtre, licencié en théologie'. But it was with the substantial proportion of his publications which fall between these two extremes, and which he wanted, for various reasons, to publish legally in France, that the greatest problems arose; he was obliged to check, divert or camouflage his spontaneous expression. In doing so he often mutilated and deformed his own thought, and that of others, as in the case of Boulainvilliers' Histoire universelle. J.-P. Kaminker rightly underlined, in his study of 'Lenglet-Dufresnoy éditeur et plagiaire de Boulainvilliers', that even his role of vulgariser was accomplished 'au prix d'atténuations et de mystifications qu'un penseur authentique ne pourrait pas consentir'.³ Along with his contemporaries we have noted again and again the obscurities, inconsistencies and blatant contradictions with which he hoped to circumvent, not to say confuse, the censorship authorities; the result is that the reader too is confused and irritated, and can very easily misinterpret the abbé's discourse. He avenged himself in the mordant irony which he directed at booksellers, censors, ministers of state for the shackles to which he had been subjected, forgetting that part of this life of perpetual compromise was of his own choosing. But it would be unfair to underestimate the pressures to which he was subjected, above and beyond the conditions affecting every contemporary writer. Our familiarity with the irregularity of life-style and unorthodoxy in ideas of innumerable eighteenth-century abbés can lead us to attach too little significance to their clerical status. Yet to them, and to their contemporaries, it could be of momentous importance, and determine the external course of their careers: abbés like Prévost and de Prades had to live a life of exile, not because their actions or ideas were more unorthodox than those of many of their contemporaries, but because they had outwardly accepted the cloak of religion, and the Catholic establishment would

least well tolerate deviance on the part of its nominal representatives. Diderot and his lay collaborators on the Encyclopédie did not have to leave France after the crisis of 1752, but the abbés de Prades and Yvon knew that they, as clerics, could expect no mercy from the combined spite of the Sorbonne and the Parlements. The dilemma facing Lenglet was a very real one, even if he was not himself either fully aware of its implications, or prepared to treat it with any degree of intellectual seriousness. His failure to do so resulted in his losing the battle on every front: he neither won respect or recognition as a major writer, nor a position of status or financial security within the establishment.

Closely related to this factor of inconsistency is the problem of Lenglet's dishonesty. We first had occasion to note a degree of deviousness in his character in the course of the Pirot affair in 1696: not only did he break confidence with his master, which one can excuse on the part of an enterprising young student in a very restrictive situation, but we may remember that he was less than honest with the printers of his pamphlets.⁴ He undercut Terrat's profits by selling his own copies to other libraires, and he fooled Langlais into thinking that Pirot was the author of the Abrégé des disputes. This was just the beginning of a life-long battle of wits with the publishers of his works, which we have evoked many times; such was his reputation, Michault tells us, that:

L'adresse et la ruse qu'il employoit dans le négoce de ses Manuscrits, l'avoient rendu si redoutable à cet égard, que le plus fin Libraire ne traitoit jamais avec lui qu'en tremblant. Il rioit souvent tout le premier et s'applaudissoit même des avantages qu'il avoit sur les Censeurs et sur les Libraires; et de la maniere dont il sçavoit les duper tour-à-tour.⁵

Again, in the context of eighteenth-century publishing, where the

rights of the author were so poorly protected and his share of the profits lamentably small, it is difficult to blame a writer who tried to beat the booksellers on their own ground. Nonetheless, the continuous wrangles with the libraires indicate that Lenglet's prime motivation in publishing was often financial, and that he was prepared to go to extreme lengths for personal gain. We have found more than enough substantiation for this conclusion in other aspects of his activities; we have seen, for example, how he grossly abused the trust of the unfortunate Adrien Maillard, who was himself in a precarious financial position. And we have looked at those extremely grey areas of Lenglet's life, when he was a spy paid by two opposing camps, and was suspected of being loyal to no one; or when, to gain his own freedom and pecuniary reward in the form of a royal pension, he played 'mouton' for the government in the Bastille, creeping into the confidence of his fellow-prisoner in order to betray it to the minister Le Blanc. Of these incidents he was justly ashamed, or at least prudent enough to maintain a silence with respect to them.

This dishonesty, motivated by greed for money, or for fame, which were often closely interrelated, also carried over into Lenglet's publications; again Michault voices the suspicions of his contemporaries:

Malgré sa vaste érudition, il est tombé dans des erreurs grossières: on l'accuse même d'avoir trompé aussi souvent qu'il se trompoit, ne se faisant aucun scrupule d'écrire le contraire de sa pensée, et de la vérité qu'il connoissoit parfaitement, lorsqu'il étoit poussé par quelque motif particulier.⁶

We have already underlined the many such contradictions in his work, which betray a lack of honesty on the part of the writer vis-à-vis his public; one example which Michault himself gives, in emphasizing the primarily commercial interests governing Lenglet's choice of publica-

tions, are those manuals for children which 'ont plus servi à sa fortune qu'à sa réputation'.⁷ We saw that Lenglet chose to draft his Principes de l'histoire pour l'éducation de la jeunesse in a question and answer form, having previously condemned this as a pedagogical method in another work, because in this way he could fill more pages and sell the work more dearly; Michault was thus correct in asserting that the abbé knew better than anyone else 'toute la frivolité de ces brochures'.⁸ Lenglet's blatant plagiarisations are just one more manifestation of this lack of respect, if not for the writer from whom they are stolen, at least for the public to whom they are addressed. Thus with the Méthode pour étudier la géographie we saw Lenglet coolly pass off the work of Martineau du Plessis as his own, until the outcry on the part of the critics forced him to admit to the theft; on other occasions, as with the plagiarisation of Boulainvilliers' Abrégé d'histoire universelle, he evaded the vigilance of contemporaries. In the latter case he went beyond the original, perhaps excusable crime of 'borrowing' from what he knew to be an unorthodox manuscript in high demand: in order to avoid the censure which Boulainvilliers' intellectual honesty and rigour would have drawn on his head, Lenglet adulterated and deformed his text without apparently suffering any qualms of conscience.⁹

Another salient characteristic, which all commentators have remarked on in some form or another, is the ironic, often cynical humour with which Lenglet related to people, institutions, and ideas alike; we are reminded of Desfontaine's description of him in 1735 as an 'auteur connu[.] par son érudition Bibliographique, par sa plume hardie et badine, et par la basse et naïve familiarité de son style'. We have seen many examples of his satirical, caustic attacks on other writers, whose style, sub-

ject, or personality happened to displease him: the censors, like Gros de Boze in 1729, had to be extremely vigilant not to let some of these remarks slip past. Likewise with regard to political figures: we can recall the amusing incident of his lampooning Philibert Orry under the features of Jacques Coeur in the Histoire de la philosophie hermétique. In fact, the ironic distance seems to have been a dominant feature of the abbé's personality, and one of the major reasons why he had many enemies, and few friends. Michault remarked of him that:

Un caractere doux, un commerce aisé, un enjouement naturel, l'auroient rendu toujours aimable dans la société, s'il avoit sçu mettre quelquefois un frein à la vivacité de son esprit; il se seroit même fait des amis, s'il avoit pu s'assujettir aux devoirs de l'amitié, ou plutôt s'il en avoit connu le prix et les douceurs: mais son coeur étoit aussi volage que son esprit étoit inconstant.¹⁰

Thus in 1742 we saw him involved in one of those inevitable literary feuds, associated with Desfontaines in an attack on the abbé de Gourné. Yet these two 'conspirators', whose characters, interests and life-styles are so similar,¹¹ on other occasions vent their satire on each other. We have just quoted one of Desfontaines' less than amiable remarks on the subject of our abbé; for his part Lenglet, in his revisions of the Bibliothèque des romans in 1739, which he obviously intended for publication, had inserted the following comment on Desfontaines' translation of the Amours de Leucippe:

On dit que cette Version est de M. l'abbé Desfontaines: je le souhaite pour l'honneur du Sacerdoce. On voit par là que cet illustre abbé s'est heureusement reconcilié avec l'amour légitime.¹²

Here, as in so many other instances, such as his attacks on J.-B. Rousseau and the abbé Prévost, there is a malicious edge to Lenglet's sally: he knew well that Desfontaines, like the other two littérateurs just mentioned, risked the wrath of the law for the moral misdemeanours of which he delights in reminding the public.¹³ He clearly felt little solidarity with other writers vis-à-vis the political authority;

himself a veteran of the Bastille, he seemed to feel no compunction about sending his colleagues there too. It is worth noting that out of a total of nine terms of imprisonment which punctuated Lenglet's life, only one, that of 1743 for the publication of the Supplément de Condé, was the result of a purely literary misdemeanor; that of 1696, we concluded, was as much a punishment for insubordination as for publishing without an approbation; and the offence associated with the publication of the Calendrier historique was a political one.

The image of Lenglet as a persecuted philosophe is therefore somewhat misleading, and particularly so in terms of his own attitudes; his 'désinvolte' attitude towards authority appears as largely personally motivated, dividing him from, rather than binding him to any of the contemporary intellectual groupings. One cannot deny that he sometimes used his cynicism and frivolity as a method of dissent from the authoritarian establishment; but he never freed himself from the ambivalent longing to be at the same time accepted by that establishment. Although we have seen that he manifested an unprecedented allegiance to the Encyclopédie, and at the age of 80 wished to be identified with the group centred around Diderot, too much in his attitudes, his personality and his style, indelibly stamped on his past oeuvre, separated him from the philosophes, and we have seen proof that he was highly suspect to them. Likewise we have found him associated on innumerable occasions with members of the Académie des Inscriptions, yet, as Michault again underlined, 'aucune Académie ne l' [a] adopté', despite his undeniable scholarly merits.¹⁴ His ironic humour was no doubt, then, the counterpart to his self-centredness and inconsistency, making his failings palatable to himself, if it did not justify them to a public which was becoming

increasingly receptive to the works of more 'committed' writers, for whom the subjects of religion and politics demanded a serious and rigorous intellectual response. There is a great difference between the use of humour and irony in the works of a Voltaire, where they become instruments for the achievement of a serious goal, and a Lenglet, where they are often gratuitous. There is a pervading cynicism flowing through Lenglet's 'plume hardie et badine', which evokes a man who had little to believe in, and was committed mainly to ensuring his own survival, at whatever cost, in his chosen activity.

It would be of interest to establish whether Lenglet's behaviour was in any way representative, or typical of a particular social group. It evokes the pattern of a kind of 'aventurier littéraire', for whom writing was a predominant interest, and who was determined to make some kind of living through publishing and related activities. Such a person would be marked by a strong individualism and competitiveness, and for him moral and intellectual considerations would not always, nor even often, come first; by definition, he is likely to be outside established literary or social institutions. An exhaustive study of the mineurs of the period might enable us to identify such a 'type', against which to set greater writers who underwent similar influences; for our present purposes we must limit ourselves to a brief look at a few contemporary writers with whom Lenglet was in some way associated.

In connection with the Rousseau affair in the early 1730 s, Lenglet was in correspondence with an abbé Jean de Vayrac; at this time, as we have seen, Lenglet was attached to the service of the Marquis de Santa-Cruz,

Spanish ambassador in France. De Vayrac, who had lived for twenty years in Spain, from whence he had moved to Paris in 1710, was for his part employed by Don Luiz da Cunha, Plenipotentiary of the King of Portugal, and temporarily residing in Holland. Paul Bonnefon describes him as 'un prêtre qui faisait, comme Lenglet, métier d'espion sous couleur d'érudit',¹⁵ and it was probably in this capacity that Lenglet first met him: he was employed by Secrétaire d'Etat Le Blanc in the uncovering of the Du Maine conspiracy in 1718,¹⁶ in which our abbé was involved. They may well have worked together under Le Blanc on subsequent assignments. The international cadre within which personages such as these two abbés operate is interesting: we have often had cause to remark on the role played by contacts outside France in Lenglet's career, not only in his diplomatic and spying activities, but also in his lucrative book-trading, and his illicit publishing ventures. In his early years, when intellectual interests no doubt held greatest sway in his life, we saw the impact on his writings of his experiences abroad, particularly his contacts with religious groups not tolerated in absolutist France. It is clear that for these two abbés, and for many other fortuneless Frenchmen, foreign countries held out a hope of lucrative employment of a more or less dubious nature precisely by exploiting their national origins. But de Vayrac, like Lenglet, returned to France primarily to write: he published a large number of works of an historical nature, such as L'Etat présent de l'empire in 1711, or his Histoire des révolutions d'Espagne in 1719, in which he put the knowledge he had gained abroad to good use. According to Michaud, de Vayrac 'avait beaucoup d'esprit et d'érudition', but his works suffered from the fact that they were written 'avec trop de précipitation';¹⁷ like Lenglet, he was known for his 'esprit caustique'. This was a trait which they also

shared with the abbé Jean-Baptiste le Mascier, whom we have found associated with Lenglet on more than one occasion. Both men were employed as agents for De Bure; they showed the same propensity to abuse their position in disfiguring the works which the publisher entrusted to their direction. Thus we found that De Mascrier inserted offensive and satirical footnotes into Dom Calmet's Traité sur les apparitions in defence of his colleague Lenglet.¹⁸ De Mascrier wrote and edited innumerable works of history, chronology, theology and literature. Michaud's judgement of him is damning:

[Il] fut toute sa vie aux gages des libraires: il s'exerçait, sans égard pour son état, sur le sacré et le profane, selon le sujet qu'on lui donnait.¹⁹

Ironically, after Lenglet's death he took over the task of directing the new edition of the abbé's Tablettes chronologiques; no doubt his approach to the task closely mirrored that which we have often seen Lenglet adopt vis-à-vis the routine job of the professional editor.

Periods spent in non-literary employment, especially abroad; hack-work as resident 'advisers' or editors for the libraires; disastrous haste in publishing their own work because of financial constraints; satire and slander aimed at other writers in the same competitive field; these are features which also recur in the lives of other, more renowned writers who crossed Lenglet's path. Pierre Guyot-Desfontaines and Antoine-François Prévost d'Exiles were again abbés who started their careers with prospects of a respectable position within the religious establishment, and who disappointed the aspirations of their families. Prévost's adventures are well known - that sequence of desertions and dishonesties which punctuate his life of wandering and exile - and need not be related here. Again we find a similar pattern in the fight

for subsistence: fringe employments, such as that of tutor to the children of wealthy families; hack-work for publishers in the Netherlands. As M. Jean Sgard underlined:

Il vivra[...] prisonnier de la pauvreté et de cette condition ecclésiastique qu'il n'a jamais acceptée complètement; il écrira pour vivre et compromettra par sa hâte les oeuvres qui lui tiennent le plus à coeur.²⁰

But, nonetheless, Prévost had the genius which was lacking in many other abbés whose situation was so similar, and out of the ambiguities of his life he forged an oeuvre which would be remembered by posterity.

Desfontaines, another of Lenglet's 'associates', also won a certain reputation as a literary critic. Again, we find him forced to abandon hope of a clerical benefice, and living off what he calls his 'métairies littéraires'.²¹ He is above all a journalist, editing a succession of literary periodicals for which he wrote most of the material himself; but he repeatedly brought disaster on his own head by refusing to keep within the limits of 'civility' in his comments on contemporary authors. Thelma Morris remarks that:

Il attaqua même les ouvrages les mieux connus, et son humeur irascible et caustique, jointe à la mordante ironie de son style, le firent redouter et détester. [...] L'on sait sa réponse célèbre à Prévost, qui le priait d'être plus tolérant: 'Alger mourroit de faim s'il restoit en paix avec ses ennemis',²²

Desfontaines may have been detested by his fellow-writers, but one can conclude from this last comment that such wars between colleagues were enjoyed by at least a section of the reading public, and that they were a saleable item. Such considerations no doubt also encouraged Lenglet to indulge his similar taste for ironic slander. If Desfontaines was a much more intelligent and perspicacious critic than Lenglet-Dufresnoy, nonetheless the similarity in their motivations and attitudes to their fellow-writers are striking. Their common self-interest led them at one point to combine against the abbé de Gourné, but true to their individu-

alistic natures they veered round to attack each other as soon as circumstances dictated it.

It is clear that these abbés had in common a comparable socio-economic condition; their lives were fraught with ambiguities, for they defined themselves as ecclesiastics, yet their interests, occupations or characters were such that they could not work within the social or intellectual framework of the church. They probably always retained the hope, however vague, of somehow, miraculously, being integrated into the system and acquiring a position of status and security - this was certainly the case with Lenglet, with Prévost, and probably with Desfontaines. The other avenues whereby they could earn a living were uncertain, and frequently, as we have seen, led to the erosion of the aventurier's personal, moral and intellectual values. Most uncertain and demoralising of all was the publishing profession, where conditions were highly unfavourable to the authors, and militated against the primacy of intellectual or aesthetic values. The damage to the reputation of those individuals who succumbed to the pressures in turn ensured that they would not be given one of the respectable posts within the literary establishment, such as censor or Academician, which if they paid little, nonetheless conferred status and renown on the recipient; this would undoubtedly operate to his advantage in the negotiation of his subsequent publications. If a writer in such a situation succeeded in producing a first-rate oeuvre, he did so against the greatest odds.

Yet in spite of all his shortcomings, Nicolas Lenglet-Dufresnoy was recognised as a literary figure of some stature by his contemporaries.

He claimed their attention and sometimes grudging respect firstly as a savant - a word which had become distasteful to the philosophes of the second half of the century²³ - but also, more controversially, as a critical historian and editor. The most enduring fame is undoubtedly attached to his bibliographies;²⁴ we have repeatedly seen commentators and critics underline and praise their originality, their scope, and occasionally their accuracy. Contemporaries and subsequent generations recognised their value as a tool in the acquisition of knowledge; they were of use both to the beginner and the specialist in the widely varied fields which Lenglet covered and which testify to the breadth of his learning. A significant degree of importance must be attached to his perception of the need for bibliographies in areas hitherto ignored by French scholarship; the 'Catalogue' of the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire, for example, contains one of the few bibliographies of American books published before 1750. In the Bibliothèque des romans 'pour la première fois, une bibliographie réunit sous le nom de 'romans' la plupart des oeuvres que nous considérons comme telles aujourd'hui'.²⁵ They were often, undeniably, inaccurate in detail, for Lenglet seems to have depended to a very large extent on his phenomenal memory,²⁶ begrudging the time it would have taken to check and verify his references; for this he was bitterly reproached by more sedate scholars who were immune to the pressures of the marketplace.²⁷ But his knowledge of rare books was exceptional, and even today's scholar cannot with impunity overlook his indications in a specialised bibliographical field. Michault, disciple of the often critical Bouhier, felt Lenglet's bibliographical work merited re-edition after his death:

Je m'imagine que le Public feroit encore aujourd'hui un accueil favorable aux Bibliothèques raisonnées de ce Sçavant, réunies dans un même Volume; mais retouchées par quelque main habile, qui rectifieroit ses erreurs, supprimerait les personnalités, et suppléeroit aux omissions essentielles: ce seroit un trésor de Librairie, fort agréable, sur-tout, aux Bibliomanes.²⁸

Unfortunately, no one saw fit to follow Michault's suggestion, except in the re-edition of individual works such as the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire.

But Lenglet was not just a savant ; though the philosophes did not always choose to recognise the fact, there was a critical dimension to his work, which, if it was not consistent for the reasons we have just evoked, can nonetheless be found to permeate through the different facets of his oeuvre throughout the sixty years of his career as a writer. We saw that as a young student of twenty-two years of age his work manifested a boldly rationalistic approach to the study of supernatural phenomena, combined with a grasp of textual criticism, and by implication cast doubt on the body of revelations on which Catholic doctrine was based. Likewise, as early as 1703, his edition of the Novum Jesu-Christi Testamentum showed a marked influence of Richard Simon and the grammariens : he was sharply criticised by the Jesuits for using linguistic techniques to establish the meaning of the text instead of relying on tradition and the Church Fathers. The Méthode pour étudier l'histoire of 1713 was in many ways a methodological mise au point , where Lenglet formulated and expanded these critical principles as they should be applied in the study of historical material. He underlined the need for a critical approach to the ancillary disciplines of chronology and geography, which he also attempted to develop in the following decades. The unorthodoxy of the application which he made of such principles in the 1729 edition, and the Supplément of the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire, which both he and the administration clearly perceived, was not a surprising development in terms of his previous work; his unavowed borrowings and adaptations from Boulainvilliers, though

they were dishonest vis-à-vis the author and the reading public, nonetheless undoubtedly expressed Lenglet's own intellectual inclinations. We have seen how serious were the accusations of incredulity, and even 'spinosisme', levelled at him by the Trévoux journalists on the appearance of this work, and how clearly they highlighted the subversive nature of the Lenglet/Boulainvilliers attempt to explain biblical miracles in terms of natural phenomena. But similar themes and methodologies recurred in Lenglet's work right up to the last publications of his life, such as the Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc in 1753. We saw that the interest he effectively took in the ideas of Spinoza was amply demonstrated by his influential edition of Boulainvilliers' Essai de métaphysique, and by the other pieces which he published under the title of Réfutation de Spinoza in 1731. We have established that this edition played an important role in the dissemination of spinozist ideas in France, and links Lenglet indirectly with the early philosophic movement. From his own point of view there was a logical progression from the publications of these middle years of his life to his role as contributor to the Encyclopédie in 1753.

Another element of Lenglet's oeuvre which was perceived by the government as critical and subversive, was his work in the field of modern French history. Gustave Lanson remarked à propos of this period:

L'histoire est un terrain dangereux d'où se retirent les gens prudents. Des érudits y marchent seuls, car ils ne sont pas lus. Et encore certains sont menacés: c'est le cas de Lobineau, et aussi de Fréret. Il faudra un casse-cou comme Voltaire pour introduire l'histoire moderne dans une voie plus critique.²⁹

If Lenglet did not have Voltaire's genius he was equally as 'casse-cou'; his daring, we have seen, was in the nature of the material he chose to publish, often precisely because it was rejected by the cautious érudits of the Académie des Inscriptions. For them the threat of imprisonment, and the loss of status and position, imposed limits on

their historical scholarship; like Secousse in his edition of the Mémoires de Condé, they would lay aside material which might be offensive to the institutions and monarchy of the absolutist establishment, by uncovering the sins and incompetence of their predecessors, or the opposition which had been offered to them. Lenglet braved the dangers of arrest, which held no mysteries for him, in order to locate, edit and annotate such texts which illuminated the history of France in recent centuries, and particularly the stormy period of the religious wars, despite the restraints which scholars like Secousse, acting on behalf of the administration, tried to put on him. All critics recognised that to these editions of texts published in the 1740's Lenglet devoted the best of his scholarship and erudition.

A closely related area, in which we have seen Lenglet was also something of a pioneer, was the publication of French literary texts of the middle ages and the sixteenth century. We have emphasised the political implications of his refusal of the literary values which had been enshrined by the royal establishment, and his assertion of the validity of all aspects of the national past: this was another facet of the abbé's rejection of authority. In Lenglet's love of crude satire, popular and archaic language, erotic and scatological imagery, we can see not just a nostalgia for the libertin traditions of the century into which he was born, or a personal taste for pornography, but also a determination to safeguard a pluralist tradition; this was no doubt one of the principal roles which fell to the lot of these individualist aventuriers whose existence I have tentatively posed as a significant phenomenon in the first half of the eighteenth century.

We can, then, conclude that Nicolas Lenglet-Dufresnoy made a significant contribution to the literature of this period as writer, editor and vulgariser of plagiarised material. Though he is little read now, never having achieved the stature of a major original thinker, his works were well-known among his contemporaries; in a number of fields he played an important role in the dissemination and 'popularisation' of free thought, though his motives in doing so were never pure, and his methodology was often extremely muddled. As a man of low socio-economic status, infamous for his lack of honesty and unscrupulous opportunism, he provided an excellent scapegoat for more 'respectable' scholars; academicians, royal censors or magistrates, they were careful to protect their own positions within the political and literary establishment by keeping within the bounds tolerated by the administration, while aiding and encouraging Lenglet in unorthodox publishing ventures of which they would be the beneficiaries as reading public. Other aventuriers like Lenglet may well have played a similar role. If his insecurity and instability marred many of his more erudite productions, it is paradoxically to Lenglet's precarious position in society that we owe such daring works as De l'Usage des romans, the Réfutation de Spinoza, or the 1729 edition of the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire. Our knowledge of the material conditions of his life and work add a new and perhaps indispensable dimension to our understanding of his oeuvre.

Notes to the Conclusion

1. Franç. 25541, f.32.
2. Oeuvres de Marot, i, 64-5.
3. Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France, lxi, 217.
4. See above Chapter I, pp.22-4.
5. Mémoires, p.56.
6. Ibid., p.54.
7. Ibid., p.63.
8. Ibid.
9. Cf. Chapter IV, pp.171 ff., and Appendix, p.473.
10. Mémoires, pp.49-50.
11. Cf. below, pp.462-3.
12. See the ms; annotations in the copy in the Bibliothèque Nationale, Rés. Y² 1214, p.8.
13. Desfontaines had been imprisoned for sodomy, a crime punishable by death, in 1725; cf. Morris, op.cit., pp.38 ff.
14. Mémoires, p.50.
15. Cf. Bonnefon, 'Jean-Baptiste Rousseau et Lenglet Du Fresnoy', p.551.
16. Cf. Lemontey, Histoire de la régence, i, 205.
17. Biog.univers., xliii, 54.
18. Cf. Chapter VI, p.405.
19. Biog.univers., xxiv, 40-1.
20. Sgard, Prévost romancier, pp.24-5.
21. Cf. Morris, op.cit., p.31.
22. Ibid., p.47.
23. Cf. Grimm's uncomplimentary obituary, in which he describes Lenglet as 'un des plus savants hommes du siècle' (see above Chapter VI, p.414) ; the term 'érudit' is also commonly used to describe Lenglet.
24. We may again recall Desfontaines' judgement, in which Lenglet's 'érudition bibliographique' is clearly designated as his most positive attribute.

25. Oudart and Sgard, 'La critique du roman', p.270.
26. There are many references made by contemporaries to his exceptionally fine memory: de Beaumont recounts an incident which occurred in Mme de Graffigny's house as an illustration of Lenglet's abilities (Année littéraire,iii(1755), 137).
27. Cf. for example, the comment by Bouhier quoted above p.451, and Michault, Mémoires, p.139.
28. Mémoires, p.140.
29. 'Origines et premières manifestations de l'esprit philosophique', Revue des cours et conférences, Mar.-Jul. 1910, p.248.

Appendix

The censorship of La Méthode pour étudier l'histoire,
1729 edition.

The history of the censorship of Lenglet's revised Méthode pour étudier l'histoire is fascinating, not only because of the extent and significance of the changes effected in the printed text, but also because of the insight it affords us into the complex pattern of influences between author, publisher, government authority and reading public in the first half of the eighteenth century.¹

We have seen that the new edition had a troubled history from the start;² the public was apparently slow to react to the call for subscriptions launched early in 1728, in illegal circumstances which drew the adverse attention of the administration to the project. But the libraires forged ahead with the printing of four quarto volumes, foolishly choosing to present a finished copy, rather than the author's manuscript, to the royal censor for inspection.³ The man appointed to this task by the Directeur de la librairie was the eminent scholar Claude Gros de Boze, Secrétaire perpétuel of the Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, and member of the Académie Française.⁴ Before submitting the work to the censor Lenglet, in consultation with the publishers, took the extraordinary step of changing the printed text, excising a number of lengthy passages from volume I, and modifying others. This necessitated the removal of 25 leaves from each printed copy (the cancellanda), and their replacement by 18 specially printed amended leaves (the cartons or cancellantia).⁵ This process was time-consuming and expensive, and Lenglet must have offered a convincing argument to the publishers to persuade them to undertake it. Whether his own decision was influenced by the advice of a third party,

such as the Marquis de Santa-Cruz, who, we have seen, intervened to smooth over some of Lenglet's problems with the administration,⁶ or whether it was taken on his own initiative, we cannot know for certain. It is possible that when Lenglet heard of the identity of his censor he judged that some of the material would not pass his scrutiny, and might even lead to the complete rejection of the request for authorisation, a consequence which would be disastrous for all concerned in the enterprise; in view of de Boze's subsequent remarks, which suggest that he was asked to submit the work to a particularly close inspection, one might even surmise that Lenglet could have been 'tipped off' by someone in the Chancellor's office as to what was in store for him.⁷ It has also been suggested that Lenglet deliberately mutilated the edition in order to whet the appetite of the public for the more subversive material which would be sold 'sous le manteau'.⁸ Although there were few bounds to the abbé's ingeniousness in manipulating his market, nonetheless this does appear to be an argument from effect to cause for which there is no substantiation: he could not have foreseen at this stage what would be the final extent of the corrections imposed on his work, to which it would paradoxically owe its renown, or as some were to say, its infamy.⁹

A glance at the excised material itself quickly reveals the reason for Lenglet's qualms in its regard: almost all the passages which he removed or changed express very clearly a critical approach to the books of the Old Testament, and are either plagiarised directly from Henri de Boulainvilliers' manuscript Abrégé d'histoire universelle, or show a very strong influence of that work.¹⁰ They represent only a small fraction of Lenglet's unavowed borrowings from the Count's study in this edition of the Méthode but they manifest perhaps most clearly Boulainvilliers' declared intention

to explain even the most momentous miracles of the Judeo-Christian tradition in terms of natural philosophy.¹¹ As we have seen, the relationship between the Boulainvilliers and Lenglet texts has been highlighted in M. Kaminker's article on the subject; in these passages they vary from direct transcriptions of whole paragraphs, to pastiche summaries, abridgements and adaptations, to less tangible reminiscences of the parent text. In some passages Lenglet draws his own conclusions, which often go beyond Boulainvilliers' in their unorthodoxy: thus where Boulainvilliers tried to prove that the Deluge was not universal,¹² but without implying that races other than that of Noah were saved, Lenglet does make this jump, coupling the discussion with another argument from the Abrégé concerning Moses' ignorance of numerous oriental races which existed in his time, such as 'celles des Nègres et ces Indiens de couleur de cuivre qui n'ont point de barbe'.¹³

Many of Lenglet's arguments show a clear influence of the seventeenth-century free-thinkers La Peyrère and Vossius: they include a discussion of the 'Préadamites',¹⁴ which he could not have found in the work of Boulainvilliers who, though he questioned the literal interpretations of the book of Genesis, accepted the fact of the creation. Also self-censored was a lengthy, highly cynical account of the role of women in history¹⁵ which Lenglet in fact had taken from his own manuscript work De l'Usage des romans, published surreptitiously some years later;¹⁶ and attacks of a personal nature on other writers, about which censors were notoriously sensitive. To sum up, the passages which the abbé saw fit to change can be categorised as follows, according to the reasons why they might have been offensive to the authorities:

<u>Religion</u>	<u>Politics</u>	<u>Defamation of Persons or Institutions</u>	<u>Correction of Errors</u>
Contrary to orthodox history or principles: 15	Offensive to monarchy, nobility or political authorities in France: 1	On literary grounds: 5	1

Number of passages classified in two different categories: 2

The number of passages does not, of course, correspond to the number of cartons inserted: some corrections related to only a few lines, while others involved the removal of up to four pages of text. Two passages were potentially offensive for more than one reason.

When the new, corrected sheets were printed and fitted into their places in the first volume, their presence could not go unnoticed by the reader for two very obvious reasons. Firstly, all the cartons except two were marked with an asterisk beside the page number; secondly, where long passages had been removed the pagination was disturbed, one new leaf carrying four page numbers now replacing two excised leaves. The practice of using an asterisk to distinguish the cancellans from the cancellandum was not altogether uncommon in eighteenth-century printing; but it must be remarked that in a work of the typographical quality of the quarto Méthode it seems incongruous that the publisher should not have tried to produce cartons which would be unobtrusive, and would not mar the material appearance of the book. It is at least possible that even at this stage Lenglet and his publisher, having decided that corrections were necessary if they were to obtain official sanction, hoped to be able to subsequently sell the original pages whose existence would be clearly advertised by the very obvious cartons.

It was in this state that the work was presented to Gros de Boze for inspection; the publishers, at least, scarcely foresaw any further complications arising. What then must have been their horror when the censor demanded changes in no less than 154 passages, necessitating the printing of 126 new cartons spread throughout all four volumes; it may well have been in reaction to this new catastrophe that the Veuve Coustelier withdrew from the enterprise in January 1729 leaving it totally in the hands of Gandouin.¹⁷ Again the changes demanded ranged from the removal of a word or phrase, to the deletion of passages of several pages in length. It is impossible to analyse their content in detail in the limits of this study, but the following broad classification will give some useful indications of their significance.¹⁸

<u>Religion</u>	<u>Politics</u>	<u>Defamation of Persons or Institutions</u>	<u>Correction of Errors</u>
I Contrary to orthodox history or principles: 26	I Offensive to monarchy, nobility or political authorities in France: 46	I On literary grounds: 29	2
II Offensive to hierarchy or institutions of the church a) Papacy: 8 b) Bishops: 1 c) Religious orders: 18	II Offensive to peoples or governments of other nations: 39	II Other grounds: 7	
Total: 53	Total: 85	Total: 36	Total: 2
Number of passages classified in two different categories: 20			
Number of passages classified in three different categories: 1			

In category Religion I there occur a few passages which again show a definite influence of Boulainvilliers' work; others relate to questions of religious tolerance, and include condemnations of the persecutions of the Huguenots in France. The remarks directed against the Papacy and religious orders (Religion II) are highly satirical and derogatory, as are

self-evidently, the significant number of passages classed as defamatory; many of these are highly personal attacks on Lenglet's enemies, such as Jean-Baptiste Rousseau and the Jesuits of Trévoux. Indeed the mark of his cynically humorous personality is everywhere stamped on this material which de Boze judged to be unfit for publication, and is its most salient feature. In the category of Politics I it was directed against prominent figures of modern French history such as Richelieu or Dubois; in this category we also find more fundamental criticisms of the French monarchy in recent centuries. In the field of international affairs the censor prudently rejected all comments which might be seen to undermine the shaky peace in Europe, such as Lenglet's attack on the Williamite 'usurpations', or on the government of Holland.

It is interesting to compare the corrections ordered by the censor with those made by Lenglet himself. Clearly, the abbé perceived the study of ancient history as the area where his unorthodoxy would be least tolerated by the authorities, and in this he was no doubt correct; the material which he cut out expresses a consistently critical viewpoint, and could be seen as a concerted attack on the authority of the Bible. In none of the other categories of material do we find this kind of intrinsic coherence. It was not by accident that the cancelled passages published by August Beyer in his Memoriae historico - criticae librorum rariorum in 1734¹⁹ were, with the exception of three relatively minor remarks, drawn from Lenglet's own corrections.²⁰ Although the total number of excised passages which fall into the category of Politics (86) is greater than the combined number of corrections in the category Religion (68), the implications of the quantitative weightings need to be balanced by a closer comparison of the nature of the material and the reasons for its unacceptability to the authorities.

The publisher, having decided to comply with the censor's orders, commenced the printing of the 126 cartons needed to replace 130 excised leaves. This time a few cartons were marked with an asterisk, but most were not. From the material point of view one of the most extraordinary aspects of the case was that the censor had asked for changes in four of the cartons already inserted by Lenglet, and thus occasioned the confusing phenomenon of 'second generation' cancellantia.²¹ Another is that Gros de Boze, who himself possessed a fine collection of books,²² saw a chance to procure a valuable addition to his library, and ordered a copy in the original state, without any of the pages corrected, to be printed on extra-large, good quality paper. This he had hand-illuminated and beautifully bound in yellow moroccan leather: after the title-page of volume I an extra leaf was inserted on which was printed the statement 'Il n'y a point de cartons dans cet exemplaire', and at the end of volume IV was copied out, on nine extra leaves, a complete list of all the changes which de Boze had ordered, together with a list of those carried out by Lenglet himself.²³ He introduced his list with the following 'Remarques':

M. Le Garde des Sceaux ayant souhaité qu'on examinât de près cet ouvrage, dont l'auteur est homme suspect en tout genre, on a trouvé dans la partie où il traite de l'histoire de la Religion, sous l'ancienne et la nouvelle Loy, beaucoup de choses contraires à la pureté des mœurs, aux principes de la foy et aux traditions Orthodoxes, Dans la partie qui traite de l'Estat présent de l'Europe, plusieurs réflexions capables de choquer les Puissances; Et dans celle où l'auteur porte son jugement sur divers ouvrages particuliers, nul égard aux bienséances de la société civile.

Ces observations ont donné lieu à une infinité de cartons; Et comme c'est icy un exemplaire unique pour l'extrême grandeur du papier, et qu'il est peut estre aussi le seul qui ait été conservé dans sa première forme, on a jugé à propos de le décorer par des Enluminures; et pour le rendre encore plus précieux, d'y joindre une note de tous les changemens qui ont été faits dans les autres exemplaires.

It is fascinating to see the royal censor so apparently unshaken by the ambiguities of his own position; as a savant and bibliophile he is concerned to preserve, presumably for posterity, material which his function should logically lead him to consign to oblivion. His copy and

list do indeed help to cast an unusually clear light not only on the fate of this particular edition, but on the whole process of censorship and its effects in the publishing trade.

It remains to establish what happened to the edition in the course of its sale and distribution: was de Boze correct in assuming that his was the only copy conserved in its original state? Were all other copies corrected in an identical fashion? Our knowledge of the techniques of cancellation indicates how unlikely such regularity would be: instructions had to be issued by the printer's warehouseman (sometimes by mutilating the cancellandum in such a way that the need to insert a cancellans would be obvious), and carried out by the folder at the bindery, who would painstakingly cut out the leaf to be cancelled, and paste the new leaf onto the stub in its place.²⁴ In a work which required the pasting of 140 cancellantia the possibilities of error were very high: the process would have demanded a large expenditure in time on the part of the folder. Apart from such material considerations, however, there were more important factors which could lead the publishers to be less than thorough in their correction. Clearly, news of the unusually high number of cancels in a work such as the Méthode would have spread quickly in the 'république des lettres', creating a reputation for unorthodoxy which would undoubtedly appeal to a certain section of the learned public; this reputation could only have been enhanced by the exchange of opinions between Lenglet and the Jesuits of the Mémoires de Trévoux which we have already considered.²⁵ Clearly many 'collectors', like de Boze himself, would have been willing to pay high prices to procure unutilated copies of the text, and if the stakes were sufficiently high, one would suspect that the publishers might be willing to oblige by failing to carry out the required corrections. In addition, those cancellanda which were cut out of the corrected copies

could be destroyed, as the law required, or they could be sold separately from the work by an enterprising bookseller or hawker. This, J.-B. Michault assures us, occurred in the case which we are now considering:

Le recueil de ces morceaux supprimés forme un in - 4^o. assez épais, qui se vendit séparément et sous le manteau, à un prix considérable.²⁶

I have found one example of a large proportion of the cancellanda being actually bound together in one volume:²⁷ this must have been extremely rare, for presumably most of the people who bought the cancellanda would already have acquired a copy of the Méthode, and would try to reunite the material in some way. In an effort to establish what was the final result of these various practices, I have collated the cartons in fourteen copies of the Méthode. For such a study to be conclusive it would be necessary to examine the greatest possible number of extant copies, and to draw them from more widely varied sources than this sample; nonetheless, our data enable us to establish a number of interesting points. We can tabulate the number of cancellanda present in each copy as follows, the total figure for an uncorrected copy being 151:²⁸

Numbers of Cancellanda

O	B.N.: Rés. G. 1072-5	
	Ste.Gen.: 4 ^o c. 387-90	
	Maz.: 16132 A-D	
	Maz.: 16132 A-D (Double)	
	B.L.: 216.b.10	
1-10	Ars.: 4 ^o H 16	(5)
11-30	B.N.: G 3616-19	(24)
	Ars.: Fol.H I	(21)
	B.L.: 581.K. 5-8	(27)
31-50	-	
51-100	Ars.: 4 ^o H 15	(103)
101-150	Ars.: 4 ^o H 14	(116)
	B.N.: G 3621-4	(131)
151	B.N.: Rés. G. 133-6	
	B.N.: Rés. G. 1077-80	

Two copies were left in their original state: that of de Boze, which we have already discussed, and a copy in smaller paper which is bound with the royal arms, and was stamped in the Bibliothèque du Roi between 1729 and 1734. It is likely, therefore, that it was specially ordered for this purpose by a member of the administration, perhaps the Garde des Sceaux himself, de Chauvelin, who was responsible for the Librairie and to whom de Boze would have reported.²⁹ The circumstances relating to these two copies must therefore be counted as exceptional, and it appears unlikely that even in a large sample we would find many others in this state. At the other end of the scale, there are five copies from which every offending leaf was scrupulously removed, counting for just over one third of our sample. Presumably these represent the 'normal' state of the copies delivered to the subscribers who had paid a fixed price at the outset: the publisher is unlikely to have taken any risks vis-à-vis the law where he could expect no additional profit.

The remaining seven copies, half our sample, fall into two clear categories: four towards the lower, and three towards the higher end of the scale. The four copies containing less than 20 cancellanda show a very clear concentration of these pages in the first and third volumes; in Ars.: 4° H 16 all five cancellanda occur in volume III, but in the other three cases volume I contains 11 - 17 of the cancellanda. Almost all of these correspond to the pages excised by Lenglet himself: these would clearly hold a special interest for many of the bookseller's clients, and it appears highly likely that they were included on the request of the buyer, for a special price. There is also, however, a heavy concentration of between 5 - 10 cancellanda in volume III of all four copies, volumes II and IV in each case containing only an odd 1 - 2 original pages. This concentration is more difficult to explain; in several of the copies it

is the same pages which are involved, yet in content they hold no particularly special interest which would single them out from the other cancellanda of volumes II - IV.³⁰ Whereas some of the odd, isolated incidences can be explained as error or carelessness on the part of the folder, another hypothesis must be raised to account for most of those in volume III. It would appear that the publisher did not print enough cartons for some of the pages to be excised, and rather than incur the expense and loss of time involved in printing a second run, decided to leave the original pages intact. This hypothesis can be substantiated by a phenomenon which I noted in volume I of each of these same four copies, but in none of the other ten: two of the cartons are in fact second editions, which can be distinguished from the 'original' cancellantia by the fact that there is no asterisk beside the page numbers. It seems clear then that these four copies were folded after those in which I found no cancellanda, and the folder ran short of cartons with which to complete his work. The publisher, on being consulted, may have shrewdly guessed that volume I, being the most notorious for its unorthodoxy, would be likely to be examined by the police from the Inspection de la librairie should they visit his premises, and proceeded to print some new cartons; but since the differences in text would be much more difficult to spot in the volumes of catalogues, he felt he could take his chances in leaving some pages in volume III unchanged.

The three copies which contain more than 90 cancellanda are clearly a different case: here there can be no question of error or expediency being the major factor in their inclusion. With the exception of Ars.: 4^o H 14, which has only 2 cancellanda in volume I, the distribution spreads fairly evenly across all four volumes; yet the three copies are distinctly different, only Ars.: 4^o H 15 being close to the original 'ideal' copy.

95 of the cancellanda in Ars.: 4^o H 14 are in fact pasted into the volumes just as the cartons should have been.³¹ This is clearly a case where these cancellanda were acquired separately from the work, confirming Michault's report; the volumes were probably originally bought with the cartons in place. It is all the more astonishing therefore that only two cancellanda of minor interest were included in volume I: one must suppose that the publisher had run short of the original pages from this volume, for fewer of these had been excised initially, and they were undoubtedly in the highest demand. The other copy, B.N.: G. 3621-4, has undergone a similar process: here, in volumes II - IV, cancellandum and cancellans are found pasted in side-by-side, but in a few instances where the original page had never been excised the owner of the copy, or his binder, made the mistake of sticking in a second, identical cancellandum beside it. Volume I follows the more general pattern, for the original pages had been left untouched in their place, a few of the cancellantia being stuck in beside them. This copy is missing only 20 of the censored pages to make it complete: it is obviously especially interesting as it enables the reader to compare censored and uncensored text at his ease.

We can conclude, then, that the material ostensibly removed from Lenglet's 1729 Méthode pour étudier l'histoire in compliance with the censorship laws was in fact circulated to a significant extent among the reading public. The inclusion of some odd cancellanda in the volumes can be attributed to error or the dictates of convenience on the part of the publisher; but that a significant proportion of the original pages were deliberately left intact in some volumes, or, more commonly, were excised and sold separately, must be attributed to a deliberate policy on the part of Lenglet and his publisher. We have Michault's testimony for

the fact that the financial gains were large, and in view of the abbé's character we can be certain firstly, that he would not have left such gains to the sole enjoyment of the publisher, and secondly, that financial profit would have been a major, though not his sole motivation in allowing their illegitimate distribution.

Notes to the Appendix

1. There have been two articles published on the subject: the first, by Manson Milner Brien, entitled 'The Censorship of Lenglet du Fresnoy's Méthode pour étudier l'histoire, 1729', was published in the Papers of the Michigan Academy, xix(1933), 427-39. Mr; Brien made a commendable effort to categorise and analyse the corrections ordered by the censor, but he does not appear to have consulted an uncorrected copy, and his statistics are grossly inaccurate. He also misunderstood, on a number of points, the technicalities of cartonnage. More recently J.-P. Kaminker, in his stimulating article on 'Lenglet-Dufresnoy éditeur et plagiaire de Boulainvilliers', indicated the extent and significance of Lenglet's 'borrowings' from Boulainvilliers. in the censored and uncensored states of his work, but unfortunately M. Kaminker also misunderstood the system of correction employed by the publishers (Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France, lxix(1969), 209-17).
2. Cf. Chapter IV, pp.168 ff.; see also Bibliography, 11.10.
3. Either of these alternatives was available to them: had they suspected the subversive nature of much of the material which the abbé Lenglet had added to the original work they would, no doubt, have chosen to submit the manuscript, and saved themselves a great deal of expense in the printing of the cartons. Cf. William Hanley's summary of the laws relating to censorship: 'The policing of thought: censorship in eighteen-century France', Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, clxxxiii, 265-95.
4. Re Gros de Boze, cf. Chapter IV, Note 6. One of the motivations of such eminent men in requesting posts as censors was the custom whereby they received a free copy of the books they examined: see below, pp. 477-8, re de Boze's copy of the Méthode, and cf. Hanley, op.cit., p.275.
5. On the technicalities of such correction see R.W. Chapman, Cancels, London, Constable, 1930, and Philip Gaskell, A New introduction to Bibliography, Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1974, pp.134-6; our knowledge of Lenglet's self-censorship is based on the notes of Gros de Boze himself which are described below.
6. See above Chapter IV, pp.169-70. Lenglet expressly states in his Dedication to the edition that the Marquis had pointed out to him 'les imperfections qu'Elle y avoit remarquées', presumably before the official publication.
7. Cf. below, p.477.
8. See Brien, op.cit., p.431.
9. Far from manifesting any attitude of collusion with the censor, Lenglet was in fact very bitter and spiteful in subsequent references to de Boze: see for example, the ms. notes he made on his copy of the Méthode

(Ars.: Fol. H.I), describing him as 'Le Sr. De Boze admirateur de tous les mauvais écrivains'; 'le fat de censeur' etc.

10. See Chapter IV, pp.170-2, re Boulainvilliers' work.
11. See quotation Chapter IV, p.171.
12. See Boulainvilliers, Abrégé d'histoire universelle, Franç. 6363-4, i, 50 ff., and Lenglet, Méthode, i, 127-8 (cancellandum).
13. Lenglet draws on Boulainvilliers' discussion, where this phrase occurs (Abrégé, i, 122) in two different passages: that concerning the universality of the flood (Méthode, i, 133-4 (cancellandum)) and also in ibid., p.93 (cancellandum), which concerns the dispersion of Noah's descendants after the Babel incident.
14. Méthode, i, 123 (cancellandum). This theory was developed by Isaac de la Peyrère in the preceding century: cf. Virgile Pinot, La Chine et la formation de l'esprit philosophique en France, 1640-1740, Paris, Geuthner, 1932, pp.195 ff.; re Vossius and La Peyrère see also Basil Guy, 'The French Image of China', Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, xxi(1963), pp.110 ff.
15. Méthode, i, 483-4 (cancellandum).
16. See De l'Usage des romans, i, pp.83 ff.
17. Chapter IV above, p.169.
18. In drawing up the categories I have followed the outline given by the censor himself of the reasons for his corrections: see p.477.
19. Dresden and Leipzig, F. Hekel, 1734, pp.166-206; the text is highly inaccurate.
20. One of the reasons for this was, of course, that the cartons marked with the asterisk were the most easily identified; the assertion made by J.-B. Michault (Mémoires, p.78) who was himself quoting the Marquis d'Argens, that all the cancellanda from the Méthode were conserved in Beyer's work, has been repeated many times subsequently, though it is, as I have indicated, highly erroneous: it in fact contains only part of the material from volume I, and none from the other three volumes.
21. I have succeeded in locating 3 of the 'first generation' cancellantia in one of the copies at the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal (4^o H 14); where Lenglet and de Boze retouched the same text these cancellantia offer a version which is intermediary between the cancellandum and the second, more common version of the carton.
22. Cf. the Mercure de France (Nov. 1753, p.131), which comments on the Catalogue des livres du cabinet de M. de Boze published in Paris in 1753: 'Le Cabinet[...]est peut-être plus riche en Livres curieux et en éditions rares que ceux de beaucoup de Souverains'. His copy of the Méthode is quoted as one of the finest examples.

23. I have identified the copy in the Bibliothèque Nationale (Rés. G.133-6) as that of De Boze, and it is, of course, from here that I have drawn much of the information on which my statistics are based. There is another ms. copy of De Boze's list in B.N. G. 1142, and it was published by Guillaume de Bure in his Catalogue des livres de la bibliothèque de feu M. le Duc de la Vallière, Paris, 1783, iii, pp.2 ff.
24. See Chapman, Cancels, pp.28 ff., and Gaskell, A New introduction to Bibliography, pp.134-6.
25. See above, Chapter IV, pp.173-5.
26. Mémoires, p.77.
27. This is in the Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal: Fol. H. 3.
28. For the identification of the library codes used see the Introduction to my Bibliography; I have given the actual number of cancellanda in brackets after the library call number.
29. Ironically, the Bibliothèque du Roi was to be opened to the public in 1735, when, presumably, a significant section of the reading public could have access to it.
30. The pages all come from the 'Catalogue' section of volume III, and contain mainly short ironic sallies of a personal nature.
31. This phenomenon also occurs irregularly with odd pages in other copies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Introduction

This bibliography is divided into two sections. Because of its size, and its central importance in the thesis, the analytical bibliography of Lenglet's printed works has been presented separately as Part I; Part II is a general bibliography of manuscript sources and printed works cited in the thesis.

The presentation of the material in Part I requires some explanation. The works are classified in chronological order of first editions; all subsequent editions are listed in chronological order after the first edition. For each translation or edition published outside France, a reference is given to the next edition published in the same language, or, where appropriate, the same country.

In the main I have adopted the conventions outlined by Philip Gaskell in A New introduction to bibliography (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1972), but the following particular features should be noted:

- a sloped stroke, / , indicates line endings, as this appears to be unambiguous in the context of eighteenth-century books
- underdotting always indicates red type
- ſ indicates long s
- ʃ indicates ligatures or digraphs
- the Contents notes are not in quasi-facsimile, but do retain the original spelling and punctuation
- * before a library location indicates copies I have not seen.

I have generally not given detailed descriptions of plates, or of the

paper and type faces used in the works, except in cases where they were essential for the identification or dating of an edition. I have, however, noted details of the press-figures, catchwords and signature styles as these features proved particularly useful in establishing the place of printing of the books (cf. Giles Barber, 'Catchwords and press figures at home and abroad', The Book collector, vol. ix (1960), pp.301-7, and R.A. Sayce, 'Compositorial practices and the localization of printed books', The Library, vol. xxi (1966), pp.1-45). This was of especial interest in my study of Lenglet's 'irregular' publications.

Many entries are incomplete. In cases where I could not obtain detailed descriptions of a work, I have nonetheless recorded whatever data were available to me, generally quoted in inverted commas to indicate that I have not personally verified the accuracy of the information.

The following abbreviations are used for libraries and catalogues which are frequently mentioned in the lists of locations:

Ars.	Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal, Paris
Bay.Staats.	Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Munich
Bib.Vat.	Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana, Rome
B.L.	British Library, London
B.N.	Bibliothèque nationale, Paris
Bod.Ox.	Bodleian Library, Oxford
Bord.	Bibliothèque de la ville de Bordeaux
B.R.BruX.	Bibliothèque royale Albert 1er, Brussels
Camb.U.L.	Cambridge University Library
Cat.Coll., Berne	Catalogue collectif, Bibliothèque nationale suisse, Berne

Frib.	Bibliothèque cantonale et universitaire de Fribourg
Gen.	Bibliothèque publique et universitaire de Genève
Gren.	Bibliothèque municipale de Grenoble
Konink.Bib.	Koninklijke Bibliotheek, The Hague
Maz.	Bibliothèque Mazarine, Paris
Nat.Union Cat.	<u>The National Union Catalog: Pre-1956 imprints.</u> London and Chicago , Mansell, 1968-
Öster.Nat.	Österreichische Nationalbibliothek, Vienna
Sorb.	Bibliothèque universitaire de la Sorbonne, Paris
Ste.Gen.	Bibliothèque Sainte-Geneviève, Paris
Tay.Ox.	Taylor Institution Library, Oxford
T.C.D.	Trinity College Library, Dublin

BIBLIOGRAPHY IThe printed works of Nicolas Lenglet-Dufresnoy

- 1.01 1./ [rule 53mm] / LETTRE/ A MESSIEURS LES [swash M U]/ Doyen, Syndic
& Docteurs/ en Theologie de la Faculté/ de Paris./ [Text from MESSIEURS,
 ...Peres, 17 lines of type]/

12°(177×100mm.): A-B⁶ [B2 unsigned; B3 signed 'Bii']. Pp.1-22.

Production: Signs. roman, irregular. Quire catchwords.

Contents: Pp.1-18, Lettre a Messieurs les Doyen...; pp.19-22, Decretum.
 Feria quinta, die 26. Juny 1681.

Copies: B.N.: D41648 bis, and Hp.743; Maz.: 33077, ff.17-28; Séminaire
 St.-Sulpice: T5 211.

Notes: The pagination indicated in the Police interrogation, Bastille
 10505, f.179, definitely establishes this as the first edition. It
 contains a large number of typographical errors. It reached the public
 around the end of June, 1696 (cf. Chapter I, p.17 and note 71). For
 details regarding the printing of the work see pp.22-3.

- 1.02 1/ [rule 57mm] / LETTRE/ A MESSIEURS LES [swash A U] / Doïen, Syndic
& Docteurs/ en Théologie de la Faculte de/ Paris./ [Text from MESSIEURS,
 ...maintenir, 19 lines of type]/

12°(157×90mm.): A-B⁶. Pp. 1-22.

Production: Signs. arabic, irregular. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: Pp.1-19, Lettre a Messieurs les Doïen...; pp.20-2, Decretum.

Copies: B.N.: D41648; D22652; R50263.

Notes: This edition doubtless appeared during the summer of 1696, before the final decision on the Mystique Cité was taken by the Faculty, but no precise date can be established. It is greatly superior in typographical quality to no. 1.01, and undoubtedly came from the same printer as no. 2.02.

- 2.01 [3 rows of typ.orns.]/ ABREGE'/ DES DISPUTES/ CAUSE'ES A L'OCCASION/
du Livre qui a pour titre, La/ Mystique Cité de Dieu, La Vie/ de la
Vierge, &c./ [Text from J'Entreprens...Abbesse, 11 lines of type] /

12°(148x86mm.): A¹². Pp.1-21.

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. No catchwords.

Contents: Pp.1-21, Abregé des disputes.

Copies: B.N.: D22651; Maz.: 33077, ff.29-40.

Notes: The details of pagination given in Bastille 10505, f.181, prove that this was the first edition of the pamphlet. For details on the printing of the work see p.23.

- 2.02 ABREGE'/ DES DISPUTES/ CAUSE'ES A L'OCCASION/ du Livre qui a pour titre,
La My-/ stique Cité de Dieu, La Vie de la/ Vierge, &c./ [Text from
J'Entreprens...en, 23 lines of type] /

12°(153x91mm.): A⁶. Pp.1-10.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-4. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: Pp.1-10, Abregé...

Copies: B.N.: D22652; R50262; ms.Franç.13924.

Notes: The type-face used in this edition is very similar to that used in no. 1.02; it is highly likely that these two second editions were produced by the same printer at the same time.

3.01 L'IMITATION/ DE/ JESUS-CHRIST/ EN FORME/ DE PRIERES,/ POUR TOUS LES
DIMANCHES/ ET/ PRINCIPALES FESTES DE L'ANNE'E,/ ET POUR LES DIFFERENS
ETATS/ DE LA VIE./ [Typ.orn.] / A PARIS,/ Au bas de la rue Saint Jacques./
Chez JEAN MUSIER, rue de Petit-Pont,/ à l'Image Saint Antoine./ [rule
59mm.] / M. DCC./ AVEC PRIVILEGE DU ROY./

16°(119x75mm.): a⁴ A-2E⁸. Pp.[8], 1-448.

Production: Signs. roman 1-4. Quire catchwords.

Contents: T.-p.; sign.a2-a3, A Madame de Harlay de Bonneuil; sign.a4,
Extrait du privilege du Roy; pp.1-448, L'Imitation de Jesus-Christ.

Copies: Ste.Gen.: Δ55161 (Collection Delaunay).

Notes: Lenglet gives 1698 as the date of this edition (Nouv.acq.franç. 3344, f.48), and in this he is followed by Michault (Mémoires, p.66) who also claims it was re-printed three times. The early date has never been attested, and Quérard (La France littéraire, v, 158) remarks that Michault was confusing the Lenglet translation with that attributed to Girin; Lenglet made no mention of any later editions. Cf. A.A. Barbier, Dissertation sur soixante traductions françaises de l'Imitation de Jésus-Christ, Paris, Lefèvre, 1812, p.108, and Augustin de Backer, Essai bibliographique sur le livre De Imitatione Christi, Liège, Grandmont-Donners, 1864, p.202.

4.01 NOVUM/ JESU-CHRISTI/ TESTAMENTUM,/ Vulgatae Editionis./ SIXTI V. PONT.
 MAX./ Jussu recognitum,/ ET CLEMENTIS VIII./ auctoritate editum./ NOTIS
 HISTORICIS ET CRITICIS/ illustratum./ Accessit Præfatio de Studio
 Sacrarum Scripturarum novi/ Testamenti: subnexæ sunt Chronologia/ &
 Geographia sacra./ [Device: classical female figure in armour standing
 by a tree, from which is draped a scroll with Greek lettering; 33×34mm]/
 LUTETIÆ PARISIORUM,/ Apud FLORENTINUM DE LAULNE,/ viâ Jacobæâ, sub
 insigni Imperatoris./ [rule 28mm.] / M. DCCIII./

T.II:

NOVUM/...illustratum./ TOMVS POSTERIOR [swash T (twice) M P]/ [Device...]/
 LUTETIÆ PARISIORUM,/ [rule...]/ M. DCCIII./

Variant imprints:

T.I:

[Device...]/ Parisiis./ RHEMIS,/ Ex Officina FRANCISCI GODARD./
 [rule...]/ M. DCCIII./

24° (121×65mm.): T.I. a⁴ A-2E⁸⁻⁴ 2F⁴ 2G². Pp.i-viii, 1-345.

T.II. A² B⁴ C-2A⁸⁻⁴ 2B⁸ [2B3 signed '2Biiii']. Pp.1-278, [14].

Production: Signs. roman 1-2, 1-4. Quire catchwords.

Contents: T.I. T.-p.; pp.iii-viii, Præfatio; pp.1-81, Sanctum Jesu-
 Christi Evangelium secundum Matthæum; pp.82-129, ...secundum Marcum;
 pp.129-210, ...secundum Lucam; pp.210-71, ...secundum Joannem; pp.272-
 345, Actus Apostolorum.

T.II. T.-p.; pp.3-248, Epistolæ; pp.248-78, Apocalypsis B. Joannis
 Apostoli; sign.2B2-2B3, Chronologia novi Testamenti; sign.2B3-2B5, Index
 Geographicus; sign.2B5-2B8, Index Epistolarum et Evangeliorum; sign.2B8,
 Judicium ... Privilege.

Copies: B.N.:A6384; Gren.: F.20.560 (imprint 'RHEMIS').

Notes: The copy in the B.N. is bound with two tomes in one volume. According to Barbier (Dictionnaire des ouvrages anonymes, iv, 1325) 'il y a des exemplaires sans les notes, en un seul volume' dated 1703 and 1733; I have not located any such copies.

4.02 NOVUM/ ...sacra [as for no. 4.01 except that ; replaces . after 'Editionis' and 'editum'] / [Device: male figure with crown and scroll bearing words IMPERIO ET VIRTUTE; 32x35mm.] / PARISIIS,/ Apud Viduam FLORENTINI DELAULNE,/ via Jacobea, sub signo Imperatoris./ [rule 39mm.] / M DCCXXXIII./

T.II:

Exactly as for no. 4.01, T.II, except for 'TOMUS POSTERIOR [swash T (twice) M U R (twice)]', and device, rule and date as in T.I.

12°(119x65mm.): T.I. Signs. as for no. 4.01, T.I. Pp. [8], 1-345.

T.II. Signs. and pag. as for no. 4.01, T.II, with error corrected.

Production: As for no. 4.01.

Contents: As for no. 4.01, The pagination and setting of type correspond with only minimal differences: e.g. T.II, p.126, where an additional reference disturbs the typographical correspondence for the space of one page.

Copies: B.N.: A6383(2); B.L.: 1408.b.25; *Bord.: T.3043.

4.03 The 'Liste des ouvrages de l'auteur' bound into the Histoire justifiée contre les romans, ed. 'chez J.F. Bernard', states that the Paris edition of 1733 'se r'imprime à Anvers in 16. 1735. 2.volum.' I have not located any copies of this edition.

4.04 NOVUM/ JESU CHRISTI/ TESTAMENTUM,/ VULGATAE EDITIONIS/ SIXTI V. PONT.
 MAX./ JUSSU RECOGNITUM,/ ET CLEMENTIS VIII./ Auctoritate editum/ NOTIS
 HISTORICIS ET CRITICIS/ ILLUSTRATUM./ Accessit Praefatio de
 Studio Sacrarum Scrip- turarum Novi Testamenti: subnexae sunt/
 Chronologia, & Geographia Sacra./ TOMUS PRIOR./ Editio accuratissima./
 [Typ. orns. in shape of cul-de-lampe] / LUTETIAE PARISIORUM,/ Apud
 FLORENTINUM DE LAULNE viâ Jacobaea/ sub insigni Imperatoris./ [rule
 57mm.] / M.D. CC. XXXIX./
 T.II.

NOVUM/[..] Sacra./ TOMUS POSTERIOR/ [..]

12° (149×82mm.): T.I. A-Q¹². Pp.1-384.

T.II. A-D¹² E⁸ F⁴ 2¹² G-O¹² P⁹. Pp.1-320, [34].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: As for no. 4.02.

Copies: B.L.: 1159.i.10-11.

Notes: There are 2 fold-out maps in T.I.

5.01 DIONYSII/ PETAVII/ AURELIANENSIS/ E SOCIETATE JESU, [swash J] /
 RATIONARIUM/ TEMPORUM/ IN PARTES TRES/ Libros quatuordecim distrib
 utum./ In quo aetatum omnium sacra profanaque historia Chro-/
 nologicis probationibus munita summatim traditur./ EDITIO NOVISSIMA/
 Ad haec tempora perducta; Tabulis Chronologicis atque/ Notis histor
 icis & Dissertationibus auctior facta./ PARS PRIMA./ [Device: as in
 no.4.02; 46×61mm.] / PARISIIS,/ APUD FLORENTINUM DELAULNE, viâ/
 Jacobaea sub signis Imperatoris & Leonis aurei./ [rule 70mm.] /
 M DCC III./ CUM PRIVILEGIO REGIS. [swash U]/

T.II:

DIONYSII/[.]JESU,/ RATIONARII/ TEMPORUM/ PARS SECUNDA./ Quâ contin
entur ea quâ ab anno 1632. ad ann./ 1702. gēsta sūnt, & Tabulâ
Chronologicâ./ [Device...]/[...]/ M DCCIII./ [...]

T.III:

DIONYSII/[.]JESU,/ RATIONARII/ TEMPORUM/ PARS TERTIA/ quâ est
τεχνη, / Hoc est, Chronologiâ methodum & Historicorum/ temporum
argumenta probationesque continet./ Quibus additâ sunt Notâ &
Disserationes duâ circa/ Nativitatem & Mortem CHRISTI./ [Device...]/
PARISIIS,/ APUD FLORENTINUM & PETRUM DELAULNE,/ viâ san-Jacobeâ sub
signis Imperatoris & Leonis aurei./ [rule 71mm.] / M DCCII./ [...]

Variant imprints:

T.I:

[rule...]/ M DCCII./ [...]

12°(165×95mm.): T.I. \tilde{a}^8 A-2C¹² \tilde{a}^{12} \tilde{e}^{12} \tilde{i}^3 \tilde{o}^2 . Pp.[xvi], 1-613, [67].

T.II. \mathfrak{P}^1 A-E¹² F⁸, $\overset{2}{A}^6$ $\overset{2}{B}$ -L¹² [Al signed 'Aa']. Pp.[2], 1-127, [7],
1-247, [3].

T.III. \mathfrak{P}^1 A-M¹² O¹² O*¹² P-R¹² S¹⁰. Pp.[2], 1-415, [13].

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: T.I. T.-p.; sign. $\tilde{a}2$ - $\tilde{a}3$, Illustrissimo Principi D. Ludovico Borbonio; sign. $\tilde{a}4$ - $\tilde{a}5$, Ad candidum, eruditumque lectorem; sign. $\tilde{a}5$ - $\tilde{a}6$, Ad lectorem editoris præfatio; $\tilde{a}7$ - $\tilde{a}8$, Indiculus auctorum...in priore Tomo; sign. $\tilde{a}8$, Summa temporum; pp.1-613, Rationarii temporum; sign. 2C8-2C12, Indiculus auctorum...in posteriore tomo; sign. $\overset{2}{a}1$ - $\tilde{o}2$, Index rerum memorabilium.

T.II. T.-p.; pp.1-127, Rationarii temporum, pars secunda; sign. F5-F8, Index rerum præcipuarum; pp.1-247, Successiones Patriarchum, Pontificum, Imperatorum, ac Regum Veteris et Novi Testamenti; sign. L11-L12, Index successionum.

T.III. T.-p.; pp.1-2, Præfatio; pp.3-415, Rationarii temporum, pars tertia; sign.S4-S6, Indiculus auctorum; sign.S6-S9, Index rerum præcipuarum; sign. S10, Continuation de privilege.

Copies: B.N.: G11551-3; Ste.Gen.: G.8 420-2, Inv.3361-3; Bod.Ox.: St.Am.239-41.

6.01 LE DIURNAL/ ROMAIN,/ EN LATIN ET EN FRANÇOIS. [swash T twice]/ Suivant la réformation du S. Concile/ de Trente./ Publié par le commandement du Pape Pie V./ revû & corrigé par Clement VIII./ & depuis par Urbain VIII./ Dans lequel sont inserez les Offices de tous/ les Saints nouveaux, approuvez par la/ Sacrée Congregation des Rits, jusqu'au/ Pontificat de CLEMENTXI ./ Avec les Offices, & les Hymnes propres au Breviaire/ de Paris./ Imprimé par ordre de Son Altesse Serenissime/ MADAME LA PRINCESSE./ PARTIE D'HYVER. [swash A Y]/ [6 typ. orn. arranged in the shape of a cross]/ A PARIS,/ Chez FLORENTIN DELAULNE, ruë S. Jacques,/ à l'Empereur, & au Lion d'or./ [rule 52mm.]/ M. DCCV./ AVEC PRIVILEGE DU ROY. [swash U Y]/

T.II:

LE DIURNAL/[.]PRINCESSE./ PARTIE D'ESTE. [swash A]/ [.]

12°(149×80mm.): T.I. \tilde{a}^{12} A-Y¹² a-i¹² *_a-*_c⁶ d¹. Pp. [24], 1-530, i-ccxii, [2], 1-38.

T.II. \tilde{a}^{12} A-R¹² S⁸ a-i¹² *_a*_b⁶ *_c⁴)(¹ k¹ [H4 signed 'Diiii'; *_{c2}, *_{c3} signed '*ii, *iii']. Pp.[24], 1-426, i-ccxii, [2], 1-26, i-vi, [4].

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: T.I. Sign. $\tilde{a}1$, t.-p.; sign. $\tilde{a}2$, Extrait des Bulles; sign. $\tilde{a}2\text{--}\tilde{a}10$, Table des festes mobiles; sign. $\tilde{a}11\text{--}\tilde{a}12$, Oraison; pp.1-530, Le Diurnal romain [parallel texts in Latin and French on each page]; pp.i-ccxii, Le Commun des Saints; sign.il2, half-title; pp.1-38, Hymnes et offices propres au Breviaire de Paris.

T.II. Sign. $\tilde{a}1$, t.-p.; sign. $\tilde{a}2\text{--}\tilde{a}12$, as in T.I; pp.1-426, Le Diurnal romain; pp.i-ccxii, as in T.I; sign.il2, half-title; pp.1-26, Hymnes et offices; pp.i-vi, Le Commun; sign.X1, Table des pseumes; sign. kl, Approbation... Privilege.

Copies: B.N.: B3793.

Notes: There is an engraved frontispiece (122x65mm.) in T.I, representing a female figure with joined hands leaning on a plinth.

6.02 Le Diurnal romain...

An edition of 1730 is entered by Quérard (La France littéraire, v, 158) but is otherwise unattested.

6.03 LE/ DIURNAL/ ROMAIN,/ EN LATIN ET EN FRANÇOIS; [swash T twice]/

Suivant la réformation du S. Concile/ de Trente,/ Publié par le commandement du Pape S. Pie V./ revû & corrigé par Clement VIII.

[swash U]/ Dans lequel sont inserez les Offices de/ tous les Saints nouveaux, approuvez/ par la sacrée Congregation des Rits,/ jusqu'au

Pontificat de CLEMENT XII ./ Avec les Offices & les Hymnes propres au
Breviaire/ de Paris,/ Imprimé par ordre de Son Altesse Serenissime/
 MADAME LA PRINCESSE./ PARTIE D'ESTE'. [swash P D]/ [9 typ. orn. arran-
 ged in the shape of a cross]/ A PARIS,/ Chez la Veuve DELAULNE, rue
 Saint/ Jacques, à l'Empereur./ [rule 47mm.]/ M DCCXXXIV./ AVEC
PRIVILEGE DU ROI. [swash U]/

12° (142x75mm.): $\tilde{a}^{12} *^{12} 2\tilde{a}^{12} \dagger\dagger^4 A-S^{12} T^2 a-i^{12}$. Pp. [24], i-xxiv,
 1-29, [3], 1-438, i-ccxii, [2].

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: As for entry no. 6.01, with two additions: 'L'Ordinaire de
 la Sainte Messe', sign. $*1-^{*12}$; and 'Les Pseaumes des Matines', sign.
 $^2_{al}-^2_{all}$. The 'Approbation' etc., dated 1726, is on sign. $^2_{all}-^2_{al2}$.

Copies: B.N.: Rés.B.7150, T.'Este' only (bound with the arms of
 Marie Antoinette, Dauphine; pages ruled in red).

7.01 Pag. 1/ [Two rows of typ. orn.] /LETTRE/ D'UN/ CHANOINE de LILLE/
 A UN/ DOCTEUR de SORBONNE,/ Au sujet/ D'une Priere heretique
composée par/ M.DESQUEUX Confesseur de/ S.A.S.E. de COLOGNE./
 [Text from 'ON vous a dit...ce dernier', 16 lines] /

12° (156x97mm.): A¹² B⁵ C-F⁶ G⁴. Pp.1-90.

Production: Signs. arabic, irregular. Quire catchwords.

Contents: Pp. 1-26, Lettre d'un Chanoine de Lille (dated 'A Lille ce 7 Janvier 1707'); pp.27-34, Reponse d'un Docteur de Sorbonne; pp.35-78, II. Lettre D'un Chanoine de Lille a un Docteur de Sorbonne, Ou les Enluminures du Portrait de M. DESQUEUX...; pp.79-88, Histoire des Episcopats de M. Desqueux; pp. 89-90, Le Decroteur poeme heroi-comique.

Copies: B.N.: D.41704.

8.01 TRAITE'/ HISTORIQUE ET DOGMATIQUE/ DU/ SECRET INVIOLE/ DE LA/ CONFESSION,/ où l'on montre quelle a toujourns été à ce/ sujet la doctrine, & la discipline de l'Eglise;/ AVEC/ La résolution de plusieurs difficultez, qui sur-/ viennent tous les jours sur cette matiere./ Par M. LENGLET DU FRESNOY Prêtre,/ Licencié en Theologie de la Faculté de Paris./ [Typ. orn.] / Imprimé à LILLE, & se vend/ A PARIS:/ Chez JEAN MUSIER, Libraire, Quay des Augustins,/ vis à vis le Pont Neuf, à l'Olivier./ [rule 63mm.] / M D CCVIII./ Avec Approbation & Privilege du Roy./

8° (154x97mm.): *⁸ **³ A-F⁸ G¹² H-O⁸ P⁶ Q-V⁸ X⁴ a-g⁸ h⁴.

Pp.I-XXII, 1-104, 105*-112*, 105-237, 240-328 (misprinting 224 as '124'), 1-109, [11].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-4. Quire catchwords.

Contents: T.p.; p.II, Quotation 'S. Antonius de Padua';
pp.III-XXII, Preface; pp.1-328, Traité du secret...; p.1, t.p.;
pp.3-109, Addition au Traité ... contenant plusieurs actes et
pieces, pour servir de preuves; sign. g8-h2, Table des chapitres;
sign. h3, Table des pieces contenuës dans l'addition; sign. h4,
Avertissement.

Copies: B.N.: D.13930; Ars.: 8° T.5608; Sorb.: TT.Sa.38.in-12.

Notes: The Traité was printed in Lille during the siege of 1708, and later distributed in Paris by Musier, who probably also published the 'Additions' which have a separate title-page and pagination: the device on the t.-p. of the 'Additions' is frequently used by Musier.

8.02 TRAITÉ/ HISTORIQUE ET DOGMATIQUE/ DU/ SECRET INVIOLE/ DE LA/
CONFESSION./ Où l'on montre quelle a toujours été à ce sujet/ la
doctrine & la discipline de l'Eglise./ AVEC/ La résolution de
plusieurs difficultez, qui/ surviennent tous les jours sur cette
matiere./ Par M. LENGLET DU FRESNOY, Prêtre/ Licencié en Theologie
de la Faculté de Paris./ Seconde Edition, revûe, corrigée & aug
mentée./ [Typ.-orn.] / A PARIS,/ Chez CHARLES-ESTIENNE HOCHEREAU, Quay des
Augustins, au coin de la rue Gillecoeur, au Phénix./ [rule 45mm] /
M. DCC. XV./ Avec Approbation & Privilege du Roi./

Variant imprints:

[..]/ Chez JEAN MUSIER, au coin de la rue de Nevers,/ à la descente
du Pont Neuf, à l'Olivier./

12° (167x92mm.): a¹² e¹⁰ A-T¹² V⁶ X². Pp. [44], 1-459, [13].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: Substantially as for edition no.8.01 with minor corrections; the only notable additions are sections XV-XVII in Chapitre VI of the Traité, and a 'Table des matières'.

Copies: B.N.: D.13931; Ars.: 8° T 5609 and 5610; B.L.: 850.b.26.

Notes: In the list of Lenglet's works bound into the Histoire justifiée contre les romans (no. 27.01) the date of the second edition of the Traité is given as 1733; this is probably a misprint, as I have found no edition later than 1715.

9.01 HISTOIRE/DE LA CONQUÊTE/ DE LA/ FLORIDE/ OU/ Relation de ce qui s'est passé dans la décou- / verte de ce Pays par Ferdinand de Soto, / Composée en Espagnol par l'Inca Garcilasso/ de la Vega, & traduite en François/ PAR P. RICHELET. / [Device: figure with arms outstretched towards tree from which branches are falling; scroll entwined in branches bearing words 'ALTUM SAPERE NOLI'; 47x37mm] / A PARIS. / Chez GEOFROI NYON, Libraire Quai des Augustins. M. DCCIX. / [rule 65mm.] / Avec Approbation & Privilege du Roy. [First A swash] /

12° (159x92mm.): π¹ a⁸ A-2Y⁶ 2Z². Pp. [8], 1-282, [2], 1-250, [10].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-3. Quire catchwords.

Contents: T.p.; sign. ā1-ā7, Avertissement; sign. ā8, Approbation

...Privilege; pp.1-281, Histoire de la Floride. Premiere partie;
t.-p., Seconde partie; pp.1-249, Histoire de la Floride. Seconde
partie; sign. 2Y4-2Z2, Table des chapitres.

Copies: B.N.: 8°01. 655.A.

Notes: The t.-p. to the 'Seconde partie' is dated 1707.

9.02 According to Quérard there is a second edition published by Nyon,
Paris, 1712, 12° (La France littéraire, iii, 255).

9.03 HISTOIRE/ DE LA CONQUETE/ DE LA/ FLORIDE:/ ou/ Relation de ce qui
..... s'est passé dans la Découverte/ de ce Païs/ par/ FERDINAND DE SOTO;/
.....
Composée en Espagnol/ par/ L'INCA GARCILLASSO DE LA VEGA,/ &
.....
traduite en François/ Par Sr. PIERRE RICHELET./ Nouvelle Edition/
... ..
DIVISEE EN DEUX TOMES: [swash T]/ Corrigée & Augmentée,/ Avec tres
belles Cartes & Figures en taille douce & d'un/ Indice./ TOME
PREMIER./ [Device: two circular pictures, each of a female figure
holding diverse scientific instruments; 79x36mm.] / A LEIDE,/ Chez
PIERRE VANDER Aa./ [rule 28mm.] / MDCCXXXI./
.....
T.II:
HISTOIRE...RICHELET. [comma omitted after VEGA] / TOME SECOND.
.....
[Swash T] / [Device...]/ A LEIDE,/ ...

8°(169x102mm.): T.I. π¹*-xx⁶ A-S⁸ T¹. Pp.[26], 1-290.

T II: v⁷ x-20⁸ 2P⁴. Pp.[2], 291-582 [misprinting 349 as '409'].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-5. Catchwords every page.

Contents: As for entry no.9.01 with the addition of an 'Indice des choses les plus memorables' (t.II, pp.559-82).

Copies: B.N.: 8° 01.655.B.

Notes: In T.I there is a map of Florida bound opposite the title-page, and 9 full-page engraved illustrations.

9.04 Quérard gives another edition: La Haye, 1735, small 8°, of which I have not located any copies (La France littéraire, iii, 255).

10.01 MEMOIRES/ SUR/ LA COLLATION/ DES CANONICATS/ DE L'EGLISE CATHEDRALE/ DE TOURNAY,/ Faite par Leurs Hautes Puissances Nosseigneurs/ les Etats Généraux des Provinces Unies,/ RECUEILLIS/ Par M. LENGLET DU FRESNOY,/ Prêtre Licentié en Theologie. [Swash T]/ [Device: fleuron, 38x24mm.]/ A TOURNAY,/ Chez LOUIS VARLE', Libraire proche/ l'Eglise Nôtre Dame./ [rule 56mm.]/ M. DCCXI./

8°(175x105mm.): *⁸ A-C⁸ 2A-G⁸. Pp. [16], 1-48, 1-112.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-4 and 1-5. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: T.-p.; Quotation from 'S. Fulgent'; sign. *2-*8, Preface; p.1, second t.-p. (no publisher's imprint); pp.3-32, Premier Memoire; pp.33-48, Recueil de pieces pour servir de preuves au 1. Memoire; p.1, t.-p.; p.2, Remarque...; pp.3-43, Cinquieme Memoire; pp.44-50, Pieces citées...; p.51, t.-p.; p.52, Quotation from 'Osius Cordub.'; pp.53-110, Sixieme Memoire; pp.110-11, Lettre de Monseigneur l'Archevêque Duc de Cambray; pp.111-12, Avertissement.

Copies: B.N.: E.4432; Ars.: 8° J 2288; B.L.: 5061 aaa 3.

Notes: The three Memoires in this edition are dated 1711; Lelong-Fontette in reference to this work dates it 'Tournay 1711, 1712, 1713' (Bibliothèque historique de la France, ed. 1768-78, i, no.5101), but I have found no editions corresponding to the latter two years.

11.01 METHODE/ POUR ETUDIER/ L'HISTOIRE,/ où après avoir établi les principes & l'ordre/ qu'on doit tenir pour la lire utilement, on/ fait les remarques nécessaires pour ne se/ pas laisser tromper dans sa lecture:/ AVEC/ Un Catalogue des principaux Historiens, & des/ remarques critiques sur la bonté de leurs Ouvra- ges, & sur le choix des meilleures Editions./ TOME I./ [Device: small medallion figuring human face, surrounded by birds and flowers; 35x38mm.] / A PARIS,/ Chez ANTOINE URBAIN COUSTELIER,/ Quay des Augustins, près la rue Gille-coeur;/ [rule 71mm.] / M. DCCXIII./ AVEC PRIVILEGE DU ROY. [Swash U, Y]/

T.II:

METHODE/ Pour étudier/ L'HISTOIRE,/ Qui contient le Traité de l'usage de/ l'Histoire, par M. l'Abbé/ DE SAINT REAL./ Un Discours sur les Historiens François [swash U]/ par M. DE SAINT EVREMONT./ AVEC/ un Catalogue des principaux Historiens & des/ Remarques critiques sur la bonté de leurs Ou- vrages & sur le choix des meilleures Editions./ SECONDE PARTIE. [Swash T] / [Device: basket of flowers surrounded by foliage, signed 'P.DC'; 36x52mm.] / A PARIS,/ Chez ANTOINE URBAIN COUSTELIER,/ sur le quay des Augustins, près/ la rue Gille-coeur./ [rule 63mm.] / M. DCCXIII./ AVEC PRIVILEGE DU ROY. [Swash U, Y]/

Variant imprints:

T.I:

[..]/ [Device: female figure in armour standing by a tree from which is draped a scroll with Greek lettering, signed 'N.DS.';

33x35mm.] / A PARIS, / Chez JEAN MUSIER, au coin de la rue de Nevers, / à la descente du Pont Neuf, a l'Olivier. / [rule 71mm.] / [..]

T.II:

[..]/ [Device: as for t.I] / A PARIS, / Chez JEAN MUSIER, au coin de la rue de Nevers, à la descente du Pont Neuf. / [rule 62mm.] / [..]

12° (166x95mm.): T.I. \tilde{a}^{12} A-V¹² X¹⁰. Pp. [24] , 1-463, [36].

T.II. π^6 A-E¹² F³, $^2A^{12}$ (\pm A3, 9, 12) $^2B^{12}$ (\pm B1, 3, 4) 2C (\pm C3)
 $^2D^{12}$ $^2E^{12}$ (\pm E3, 10) $^2F^{12}$ (\pm F4, 6) $^2G^{12}$ $^2H^{12}$ (\pm 2H9) $^2I^{12}$ (\pm I9)
 $^2K-N^{12}$ $^2O^{12}$ (\pm 08) $^2P^7$ [π^4 signed 'a_{ii}'; A3 signed 'Aii'] . Pp. [12],
 1-120, 119-120, 121-4, 1-344, [6] .

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: T.I. T.-p.; Quotation from Cicero; sign. $\tilde{a}2-\tilde{a}10$, Préface; sign. $\tilde{a}10-\tilde{a}12$, Table des chapitres; pp.1-463, Methode pour etudier l'Histoire; sign. V8-X8, Table des Matieres; sign. X9-X10, Approbation...Privilege.

T.II. T.-p.; $\pi^2-\pi^3$, 'A Monsieur l'Abbé de Louvois, Bibliothequaire du Roy', signed Coustelier; $\pi^4-\pi^6$, Preface; p.1, half-title; pp.3-101, De l'usage del'histoire par M. l'abbé de S. Real; pp.102-24, Discours sur les historiens françois; p.1, half-title; pp.3-344, Catalogue des principaux historiens [dated 'M. DCCXII.']; sign. P5-P7, Table des Traitez & des Articles.

Copies: B.N.: G.32874-5; Maz.: 50210; B.L.: 580, c.21 - 2.

Notes: The only other difference between the two issues is the addition by Musier of a two-leaf 'Catalogue des livres imprimez' at the end of t.I.

A number of copies of both issues do not contain the dedication to the Abbé de Louvois.

For details of dates of publication, cancelled material etc. see Chapter II, pp.79 ff.; a number of the cancelled passages were quoted in the Journal littéraire, Mar.-Apr. 1714, p.362.

11.02 METHODE/ POUR ETUDIER/ L'HISTOIRE./ Où après avoir établi les principes & l'ordre/ qu'on doit tenir pour la lire utilement, on/ fait les remarques nécessaires pour ne se/ pas laisser tromper dans sa lecture:/ AVEC/ Un Catalogue des principaux Historiens, & des re-/ marques critiques sur la bonté de leurs Ouvrages, / & sur le choix des meilleures Editions./ Par M. LANGLET DU FRESNOY, Prêtre Licentié/ en Theologie./ TOME PREMIER./ [Device: fleuron; 37x35mm.]/ A BRUXELLES./ Aux Dépens de la Compagnie. 1714./ [rule 63mm.]/ AVEC APPROBATION./

T.II.

METHODE/ POUR ETUDIER/ L'HISTOIRE,/ Qui contient le traité de l'Usage de l'Histoi-/ re, par M. l'Abbé DE SAINT REAL./ Un Discours sur les Historiens François par/ M. DE SAINT EVREMONT./ Instructions pour l'Histoire, par le P.RAPIN/ de la Compagnie de JESUS./ AVEC/ Un Catalogue des principaux Historiens & des Re-/ marques critiques sur la bonté de leurs Ouvrages/ & sur le choix des meilleures Editions./ TOME SECOND./ [..]

T.II, Part 2.

CATALOGUE/ DES PRINCIPAUX/ HISTORIENS,/ AVEC/ DES REMARQUES CRITIQUES/ Sur la bonté de leurs Ouvrages & sur le/ choix des meilleures Editions./ Par M. LANGLET DU FRESNOY, Prêtre/ Licentié en Theologie.

[swash T]/ TOME SECOND/[Device: a sphere with a band across it carrying Greek letters; 35x29mm] / A COLOGNE,/ Chez PIERREMARTEAU./ [rule 64mm.] / M. DCC. XIII./

8°(156x95): T.I. *⁸ A-G⁸ G*⁸ H⁸ I⁸ (±II,2) K-X⁸ Y⁵. Pp [6], 1-112, 113*-128*, 113-346.

T.II. *⁴ a⁸ (-al) b-e⁸ f⁶ g-m⁸ n⁴ A-T⁸ V³. Pp.[8], 3-196, 1-304, [6].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-4. No catchwords except in the Catalogue, where there are catchwords on every page.

Contents: T.I. As for no.11.01, without the 'Approbation...'.
T.II. As for 11.01, without the dedication, and with the addition of

the 'Instructions pour l'histoire, par le P.Rapin', pp.93-196.

Copies: B.L.: 580.c.23-4; Tay.Ox.: Vet.Fr II.A595 - 6; Bibl. Cath. de Louvain: A26672.

Notes: Vol.I of this edition undoubtedly represents the original version of Lenglet's text, which he modified for the Paris edition (cf. Chapter II, pp.79 ff.); there were, on the other hand, some minor additions to the Paris edition which are missing here. Some of the passages which were unique to this Brussels edition were published subsequently by J.B. Mencke (see no.11.03, T.I). The Catalogue, which is a separate typographical entity, was printed after the publication of the Paris edition. Lenglet clearly started giving his manuscript to the Brussels publishers in a piecemeal fashion, which appears to have been his normal way of working; it suggests that he was working against time, and accounts for some of the errors and anomalies in his works and editions.

11.03 METHODE/ POUR ETUDIER/ L'HISTOIRE,/ Où/ Après avoir établi les principes & l'ordre qu'on/ doit tenir pour la lire utilement, on fait les/ remarques nécessaires pour ne se pas laisser/ tromper dans sa lecture:/ AVEC/ Un Catalogue des principaux Historiens,

& des/ remarques critiques sur la bonté de leurs Ouvra- ges, &
sur le choix des meilleures Editions; consi- derablement augmenté/
 par/ J. B. MENCKE,/ Conseiller & Historiographe/ de Sa Maj.Pol./
 DERNIERE EDITION,/ Revuë selon les copies de Paris & de Bruxelles/
& exactement corrigée./ [rule 74mm.] / A LIPSIC,/ Chez JEAN FREDERIC
 GLEDITSCH & FILS./ [rule 38mm.] / M. DCC XIV./

T.II:

CATALOGUE/ DES PRINCIPAUX/ HISTORIENS,/ AVEC DES REMARQUES
 CRITIQUES/ Sur la bonté de leurs Ouvrages & sur/ le choix des
 meilleures Editions./ NOUVELLE EDITION/ Soigneusement revuë &
 augmentée de/ plusieurs livres & remarques/ par/ J.B. MENCKE,/
 Conseiller & Historiographe de Sa Maj./ Polon./ [rule 62mm.] /
 A LIPSIC,/ Chez JEAN FREDERIC GLEDITSCH/ & FILS./ [rule 33mm.] /
 M DCC XIV./

8°(157x90mm.): T.I. a-b⁸ c⁴ A-2P⁸ 2Q⁴ [A3 signed 'A5'; E5 signed
 'D5'; K2, K3 signed 'L2, L3'; 2E4 signed '2E3'] . Pp.[40], 1-583,
 [33] (misprinting 176 as '276').

T.II. a-2g⁸ [x6 signed 'x2'; 2c3 signed '2c5']. Pp.1-446, [34].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-5. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: T.I. Follows text of edition no.11.01 with a few additional
 notes by Mencke which are marked with an obelisk. Mencke added the
 following preliminaries: sign. a2-a5, A Leurs Altesses Serenissimes,
 Messeigneurs les Princes de Saxe-Gothe; sign. a5-a7, Nouvelle
 Preface; sign. a7-b1, Additions qui se trouvent dans l'edition
 de Bruxelles. The two dissertations by Saint-Evremond and Saint-
 Réal are also included in this tome.

T.II. The 'Catalogue des historiens' was re-arranged and greatly expanded by Mencke, especially the sections on the history of the German Empire; most of Mencke's additions have been distinguished by an obelisk.

Copies: B.N.: G.32837; B.L.: 1492.dd.41 (T.I), 9007.aaaa.10 (T.II).

Notes: This edition is printed on very poor quality paper. The page lay-out of T.I follows that of the Paris edition (no.11.01) very closely. Cf. below no.11.06.

- 11.04 Quérard lists an edition 'Paris, Hochereau, 1716, 4 volumes in-12' (La France litteraire, v, 159): I. have not found any trace of such an edition. There is possibly some confusion here with the Méthode pour étudier la géographie of the same year (see no. 13.01). Lenglet was, nonetheless, planning such an edition in 1714 (see Chapter II, p. 83).

- 11.05 METODO/ PER ISTUDIARE/ LA STORIA,/ in cui dopo avere ^èstabiliti i principi, e l'/ ordine, che dee tenersi per leggerla/ utilmente, si fanno le osservazioni neces- / sarie per non lasciarsi ingannare nella/ lettura di essa:/ CON/ Un Catalogo de' principali Storici, e con Osservazioni/ Critiche sulla bontà delle loro opere, e sul-/ la scelta delle migliori edizioni:/ Scritto in lingua Francese/ Dal Sig. Dottor Langlet di Fresnoy, Sacerdote/ Licenziato in Teologia,/ E tradotto in lingua Italiana./ TOMO PRIMO./ [Device: fleuron; 24x28mm] / IN VENEZIA, MDCCXVI./ Appresso Sebastiano Coleti./ Con Licenza de' Superiori, e Privilegio./

T.II:

[rule 63mm.] / METODO/ PER ISTUDIARE/ LA STORIA,/ OSIA/ Catalogo de' principali Storici, con Osservazioni/ Critiche sopra la bontà

delle loro opere, e/ sulla scelta delle migliori edizioni./

COMPOSTO/ Dal Sig. Dottor Langlet di Fresnoy, Sacerdote/ Licenziato
in Teologia,/ Accresciuto poi da Gianbattista Menkenio, E ampliato
finalmente in questa traduzione/ di tutte le Storie particolari
d'Italia./ TOMO SECONDO./ [Device: as in T.I.] / [.]

8° (176x120mm.): T.I. *⁷*⁶ A-V⁸ X⁴. Pp. [26], 1-325, [3].

T.II. *⁴ A-Y⁸; Pp. [8], 1-352.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-4. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: T.I. The translation is based on the text of edition
no.11.03, with the substitution of the following for the pre-
liminaries: sign.*3-*7, All 'Illustriss. e Reverendissimo
Monsignor Maffeo Farsetti, Protonotajo apostolico, Governatore
di Fano, ec. [signed 'Bastiano Coleti']; sign.*5-*~~6~~6, Il
librajo a chi legge; sign.*~~6~~6, Noi refformatori dello Studio de
Padoa. The 'Dissertations' by Saint-Evrémont and Saint-Réal have
been omitted.

TII: The 'Catalogue' has been translated from edition no.11.03,
with a considerable number of additions, particularly relating to
the history of Italy, which have been marked ¶.

Copies: Maz.: 52059 (1-2); B.L.: 580.a.5; Bod.Ox.: 8°<.193
(T.I only).

Notes: This translation was attributed to Apostolo Zeno (see
Chapter II, p.82, and note 155). Cf. below no.11.07.

11.06 [In gothic type] Des herrn Abts/ LANGLET DU FRESNOY/ Anweisung/

 zur/ Erlernung der historie,/ Nebst einem vollständigen/
 Verzeichnis/ Der/ vornehmsten Geschicht=Schreiber,/ Worinnen/ Die

 besten Auflagen fleißig angemercket, und/ die Bücher nach ihrem
 Werth und Unwerth/ beurtheilet werden;/ In dieser Übersetzung

 aufs neue genau übersehen,/ und durch und durch, mehrentheils

 aus eigener/ Bibliothek, mit sehr vielen neuen Articuln und/
 Anmerkungen vermehrt,/ Durch/ D. Jo. Burchard Mencken,/ K.R. und

 P.P./ [rule 85 mm.] / LEIPZIG,/ Ben Joh. Friedrich Gleditschens

 seel. Sohn,/ 1718./

T.II:

[Title in black only] Vollständiges/ Verzeichnis/ der vornehmsten/
 Geschicht=Schreiber,/ Worinnen/ Die besten Auflagen fleißig
 angemercket,/ und die Bücher nach ihrem Werth und/ Unwerth
 beurtheilet werden;/ Anietzo aufs neue genau übersehen, und/
 durch und durch, mehrentheils aus eigener/ Bibliothek, mit sehr
 vielen Articuln und/ Anmerkungen vermehrt,/ Durch/ [..]

8°(175x102mm.): T.I. sign. a-b⁸ A-2K⁸ 2L⁴ [E5 signed D5]. Pp. [32],
 1-486, [50] (misprinting 211 as '112').

T.II.)(⁴ A-2M⁸. Pp. [8], 1-512, [48].

Production: Signs. gothic 1-5. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: This is a translation of edition no.11.03 with some
 additions to the 'Catalogue'.

Copies: T.C.D.: Fag.H.10.35-36; Frib.: Fa.40; *Bayerische
 Staatsbibliothek, München: H.un.337.

Notes: Cf. no.11.19 for further German edition.

11.07 METODO/ PER ISTUDIARE/ LA STORIA,/ In cui dopo avere stabiliti i principi, e l'ordine,/ che dee tenersi per leggerla utilmente, si fanno/ le osservazioni necessarie per non lasciarsi ingannare nella lettura di essa:/ CON/ Un Catalogo de' Principali Storici, e con Osservazioni/ Critiche sulla bontà delle loro opere, e/ sulla scelta delle migliori edizioni;/ Scritto in Lingua Francese/ Dal. Sig. Dottor Langlet di Fresnoy, Sacerdote/ Licenziato in Teologia,/ E tradotto in lingua Italiana./ TOMO PRIMO./ Edizione seconda corretta, ed accresciuta./ [Device: fleuron, 20x30mm.] / IN VENEZIA, MDCCXXVI./ Appresso Sebastiano Coleti./ Con Licenza de' Superiori, e Privilegio./

T.II:

METODO/ PER ISTUDIARE/ LA STORIA,/ OSIA/ Catalogo de' principali Storici, con Osservazioni/ Critiche sopra la bontà delle loro opere, e/ sulla scelta delle migliori edizioni./ COMPOSTO/ Dal Sig. Dottor Langlet di Fresnoy, Sacerdote/ Licenziato in Teologia./ Accresciuto poi da Gianburcardo Menkenio,/ E ampliato finalmente in questa traduzione di tutte/ le Storie particolari d'Italia./ TOMO SECONDO./ Edizione Seconda corretta, ed accresciuta./[..]

8° (180x124mm.): T.I.*¹² A-R⁸. Pp. [24], 1-268, [4].

T.II.*⁴ A-Y⁸. Pp. [8], 1-351.

Production: As for no.11.05.

Contents: As for edition no.11.05.

Copies: Maz.: 36309 (1 2); Union Cat.;

Bod.Ox.: 8° 194 (T.II only).

Notes: See no. 11.14 below.

11.08 A/ NEWMETHOD/ OF/ Studying HISTORY: [swash T, Y]/ Recommending more EASY and COMPLETE/ INSTRUCTIONS/ FOR/ IMPROVEMENTS in that SCIENCE/ Than any hitherto Extant:/ With the whole Apparatus necessary to Form a/ PERFECT HISTORIAN./ [rule 87mm.]/ In TWO VOLUMES./ [rule 86mm.]/ CONTAINING,/ [To left of vertical double rule, 41mm.:] I. The SCIENCES prepa-/ ratory to the STUDY of HIS-/ TORY, viz. GEOGRAPHY,/ CHRONOLOGY, &c. the END/ proposed thereby, and the/METHOD to be observed in/ READING it./ II. OF HISTORY, Sacred/ and Profane, including the/ several PARTS of the WORLD,/ according to their PROPER DIVISIONS./ [To right of rule:] III. Of the HISTORIES/ of ROYAL FAMILIES, of/ ARTS and SCIENCES, Reli-/ gious and Military ORDERS,/ &c. the CHARACTER of a/ Good and Bad HISTORIAN,/ and RULES for the JUDGING/ of HISTORICAL FACTS./ IV. A CATALOGUE of the/ chief HISTORIANS of all NA-/ TIONS, their best Editions, and/ Characters of their WRITINGS./ [Horizontal rule 86mm.]/ Originally written in French by M. L'ANGLET DU FRESNOY, Librarian to Prince/ EUGENE. Since translated into Italian, with considerable Additions. The/ Whole made English, with variety of Improvements and Corrections, and a/ copious INDEX of AUTHORS Also, A DISSERTATION by Count SCIPIO/MAFFEI of Verona, concerning the USE of INSCRIPTIONS and MEDALS, by/ Way of PARALLEL./ [rule 86mm.]/ By RICHARD RAWLINSON, LL.D. and F.R.S./ [rule 86mm.]/ ---- Siquid noviſti rectius iſtis/ Candidus imperti, ſi non his utere mecum. HORAT./[rule 86mm.]/ LONDON: Printed for W. BURTON in St. John's-Lane, near Hicks's-Hall;/ and Sold by J. BATLEY in Pater-noſter-Row; C. RIVINGTON in St. Paul's/ Church-Yard; W. MEADOWS in Cornhill; L. GILLIVER over-againſt St./ Dunſtan's Church, Fleet-Street; J. AYSHFORD in Weſtminſter-Hall; and/ J. WILCOX in Little-Britain. M.DCC.XXVIII./

T.II.

A/ NEW METHOD/ OF/ Studying HISTORY:/ Recommending more EASY and
COMPLETE/ INSTRUCTIONS/ FOR/ IMPROVEMENTS in that SCIENCE/ Than
any hitherto Extant:/ With the whole Apparatus necessary to Form
a/ PERFECT HISTORIAN./ [rule 86mm.]/ VOL. II./ [rule 86mm.]/
CONTAINING,/A CATALOGUE of the chief HISTORIANS of all Nations,/
their best EDITIONS, and CHARACTERS of their WRITINGS,/ with
considerable ADDITIONS and CORRECTIONS./ [rule 86mm.]/ By RICHARD
RAWLINSON, LL.D. and F.R.S./ [rule 85mm.]/ Nescire quid antea quam
natus sis acciderit, id est semper esse Puerum./ Cicero de Oratore./
[rule 86mm.]/ LONDON:/ Printed in the YEAR M.DCC.XXVIII./

Variant imprints:

[..]/ Printed by W. Burton in St. John's-Lane, near Hick's-Hall.
1728/

8°(198x125mm.): T.I. π^4 A-Z⁸. Pp. [8], i-xxii, 23-360, [8].

T.II. A¹ B-2N⁸ 20-2S⁴. Pp. [2], 1-550, [50].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-4. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: This edition is a translation of the Italian edition
(no.11.05), with minor corrections, notes and additions inter-
spersed throughout, and the following items added to T.I.:

sign. π^3 - π^4 , To the Reader; pp.323- 60, A letter from Count Scipio
Maffei [...] being a comparison of the use of Inscriptions and
Medals.

Copies: T.C.D.: PP.O.16-17; B.L.: 304.f.23; Bod.Ox.: 8° Rawl.

420-2.

Notes: There are manuscript notes by the editor (mainly additions to the Catalogue) in the Bodleian copy mentioned above.

Cf. below no.11.11 for separate issue in 1730.

11.09 METHODE/ POUR/ ETUDIER L'HISTOIRE,/ AVEC/ Un Catalogue des
principaux Historiens, & des Remar-/ ques Critiques sur la bonté
de leurs Ouvrages, & sur/ le choix des meilleures Editions./ Par
M. 1' ABBE' LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ NOUVELLE EDITION,/ Proposée par
Souscription, avec des Cartes Géographiques/ & Chronologiques;
trois Volumes in quarto,/ Grand Papier./ [Device: fleuron, signed
'V.LS'; 35x67mm.]/ A PARIS, Quay des Augustins./ Chez/ [ornamental
bracket enclosing 3 lines:] PIERRE GANDOUIN, à la belle Image./ &/
La Veuve d'ANTOINE-URBAIN COUSTELIER./ [rule 66mm.]/ MDCCXXVIII./

4°(288x215mm.): A-C⁴ [B2 signed 'Cii'] . Pp.1-18, [6].

Contents: T.-p.; pp.3-6, Avertissement; pp.7-12, Méthode pour
étudier l'histoire [Chapitre VI]; pp.13-18, Catalogue des principaux
historiens [Articles XXIX-XXX]; sign. C2-C4, Table des chapitres.

Copies: B.N.: G.1142 and G.3621; Maz.: 2652^{U19} (82e pièce).

Notes: This prospectus offers for subscription an edition in-4°,
3 vols., all copies to be printed on grand papier . The price
will be 30 livres for subscribers, and 45 l. for non-subscribers,
though the publisher warns the public that it is intended to print
only a small number of surplus copies over and above the subscrip-
tions received. Lenglet also offers for subscription four large
copper-engraved Tables chronologiques de l'Histoire Universelle:
subscribers can buy these for 6 livres; non-subscribers will have
to pay 12 l. The whole will be ready for delivery by the month of
November.

In the B.N. copy (G.1142) there are 14 pages of manuscript notes
relating to the censorship of the Méthode when it finally appeared:
these are copied from De Boze's notes which were bound into his own
copy (see below no.11.10).

11.10 METHODE/ POUR/ ETUDIER L'HISTOIRE,/ AVEC/ Un Catalogue des
 principaux Historiens, & des Remarques sur la/ bonté de leurs
 Ouvrages, & sur le choix des meilleures Editions./ Par M. L'ABBE'
LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ NOUVELLE EDITION,/ Augmentée & ornée de Cartes
Géographiques./ TOME PREMIER. [TOME II./ TOME III./ TOME IV.]/ [Device:
 cul-de-lampe, with central element in form of a canopy; 48x66mm.]/
 A PARIS,/ Chez PIERRE GANDOUIN, Quay des Augustins, à la belle/
 Image./ [rule 66mm.]/ M. DCC. XXIX./ Avec Approbation & Privilege
du Roy./

T.IV.

Minor variations from above: (i) accent omitted in 'Geographiques'
 (ii) line distribution in colophon: '[..]Quay des Augustins,/ à la
 belle Image./ [.]'

Variant title-page:

Exactly as for title-page of no.11.12, but with date 'M. DCC. XXIX.'.

4° (282x213mm.): π^2 a-b⁴ A⁴(±A4) B-C⁴ D⁴(±D3) E⁴(±E2) F-H⁴ I⁴(±I2)
 K⁴(-K3,4; +K3) L⁴(±L2) M⁴(-M3,4; +M3) N-O⁴ P⁴(±P3) Q⁴(-Q1-4;
 +Q1,2) R⁴(-R2.3; +R2) S⁴(±S4) T⁴(±T1,2) V⁴(±V1,3) X⁴ Y⁴(±Y2) 2A⁴
 (±2A2) 2B⁴(-2B3,4; +2B3) 2C⁴ 2D⁴(±2D1) 2E-M⁴ 2N⁴(±2N1) 2O-P⁴ 2Q⁴
 (±2Q3) 2R-3B⁴ 3C⁴(±3C4) 3D-O⁴ 3P⁴(-3P2.3; +3P2) 3Q-T⁴ 3V⁴(±3V1)
 3X-Z⁴ 4A⁴(±4A3) 4B⁴. Pp. [4], i-xvi, 1-568(misprinting 293 as '285').
 T.II. a³ A-M⁴ N⁴(±N4) O⁴(±O1,2) P⁴(±P2) Q⁴ R⁴(±R1) S-V⁴ X⁴(±X2)
 Y⁴(±Y3) Z⁴ 2A⁴(±2A1) 2B⁴ 2C⁴(±2C1) 2D⁴(±2D4) 2E⁴ 2F⁴(±2F3) 2G⁴
 (-2G2.3; +2G2) 2H⁴ 2I⁴(±2I2) 2K⁴(±2K4) 2L⁴(±2L3) 2M-N⁴(±2M2;
 -2M4, 2N1; +2M4; ±2N3) 2O⁴(±2O2) 2P⁴(±2P3) 2Q⁴(±2Q2) 2R⁴(-2R2.3;
 +2R2) 2S-V⁴ 2V⁴(±2V*1,3,4) 2X⁴(±2X2,4) 2X⁴ 2Y⁴(±2Y4) 2Y⁴
 (±2Y*1) 2Y⁴ 2Y⁴ 2Y⁴ 2Z⁴(±2Z2) 3A⁴(-3A1,2; +3A2) 3B-K⁴

$3L^4 (\pm 3L4)$ $3M-N^4$ $3O^4 (\pm 3O3)$ $3P-S^4$ $3T^4 (\pm 3T4)$ $3U^4$ $3X^4 (\pm 3X4)$ $3Y^4 (\pm 3Y1)$
 $3Z-4C^4$. Pp. [6], 1-344, 337*-344*, 345-352, 345*-352*, 353-360,
 353*-380*, 361-576.

T.III. $\pi^1 a^4 b^2 \underline{A-Q}^4 A-F^4 G^4 (\pm G2) H^4 (\pm H3) I (\pm I2) K^4 L^4 (\pm L2) M^4 (\pm M3)$
 $N^4 (\pm N1) O^4 (\pm O1,2) P-Q^4 R^4 (\pm R1) S^4 T^4 (\pm T2,3) V^4 (\pm V1,3) X^4 Y^4 (\pm Y1)$
 $Z-2A^4 2B^4 (\pm 2B3) 2C^4 (\pm 2C1) 2E^4 2F^4 (-2F3) 2G^4 2H^4 (\pm 2H4) 2I-O^4 2P^4$
 $(\pm 2P2) 2Q-V^4 2X^4 (\pm 2X1,2) 2Y^4 (\pm 2Y2) 2Z-3A^4 3B^4 (\pm 3B1,3) 3C-G^4 3H^2$
 $(\pm 3H2)$. Pp. [14], 1-128, 1-428 (misprinting 367 as '370').

T.IV. $\pi^1 a^4 A^4 (\pm A3,4) B^4 (\pm B2) C-D^4 E^4 (\pm E4) F^4 (\pm F1,4) G-H^4 I^4 (\pm I3)$
 $K^4 (\pm K2) L^4 (\pm L1,3) M-N^4 O^4 (\pm O3) P^4 (\pm P3) Q^4 (\pm Q3,4) R^4 (\pm R2,3,4) S^4$
 $(\pm S1) T^4 (\pm T1) U^4 X^4 (\pm X3,4) Y^4 (\pm Y4) Z (\pm Z1) 2A^4 (\pm 2A1,3) 2B^4 2C^4 (\pm 2C3)$
 $2D^4 (\pm 2D2) 2E-H^4 2I^4 (\pm 2I4) 2K^4 (\pm 2K1) 2L-M^4 2N^4 (\pm 2N4) 2O^4 (\pm 2O2)$
 $2P^4 (\pm 2P1,3) 2Q^4 (\pm 2Q1-4) 2R^4 (\pm 2R2) 2S^4 2T^4 (\pm 2T3) 2U^4 2X^4 (\pm 2X4) 2Y^4$
 $(\pm 2Y1,3) 2Z^4 (\pm 2Z2,4) 3A^4 3B^4 (\pm 3B2,3) 3C-H^4 3I^4 (\pm 3I1,4) 3K^4 (\pm 3K3)$
 $3L^4 3M^4 (\pm 3M1,3,4) 3N^4 (\pm 3N2) 3O-4B^2 4C^3 4D-I^2 \chi^1$. Pp. [10], 1-520,
 519-20, 521-45, [5].

Contents: T.I. H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-xiv, 'A Son Excellence Monseigneur
 le Marquis de Santa Cruz de Marzenado'; pp.xv-xvi, Table des chapitres;
 pp.1-560, Méthode... [Chap.I-XVII]; pp.561-8, Table des matières.

T.II. Sign.al, t.-p.; sign.a2-a3, Table des chapitres; p.1, h.t.;
 pp.3-464, Méthode... [Chap.XVIII-LXII]; pp.465-552, Choix des livres
 nécessaires pour la lecture de l'histoire; pp.553-62, Table des
 auteurs; pp.563-76, Table des matières.

T.III. H.-t.; sign.al, t.-p.; sign.a2-b2, Table des chapitres; p.1,
 h.-t.; pp.3-128, Canons chronologiques de l'histoire ancienne; p.1,
 h.-t.; p.2, 'Seneca epistola II...'; pp.3-428, Catalogue des prin-
 cipaux historiens.

T.IV. H.-t.; sign. al, t.-p.; sign.a2-a4, Table des chapitres;
 p.1, h.-t.; pp.3-472, Catalogue des principaux historiens; pp.473-
 545, Table des auteurs et matieres; sign.4I1-4I2, Catalogue des
 livres qui se vendent chez Pierre Gandouin; Approbation...Privilège.

Copies: B.N.: Rés.G.133-6; B.L.: 216.b.10-13; T.C.D.:PP.gg.10-13

(see also Appendix,p.479).

Notes: There are 11 fold-out engraved maps in T.I, and 12 in T.II.

The asterisked pages in T.II do not break the continuum of the text, and occur in all copies; the asterisk was also used to distinguish many of the cartons, or cancellantia, which were printed to replace the excised pages. For details regarding the publication and censorship of this edition see Chapter IV, pp.168-77, and Appendix.

A number of copies were printed on 'papier impérial', and are as large as a small folio volume. One such copy was acquired by Claude Gros de Boze, the censor of the edition, in its original, uncorrected state: this superb copy, with hand-illuminated maps, is now located in the B.N. (Rés.G.133-6).

It would appear that the variant title-page was printed in 1734 at the same time as edition no.11.12: possibly Gandouin had a few copies of the 1729 ed. left, lacking a title-page. Of the 2 such copies which I have seen one belonged to Lenglet himself (Ars.: Fol.H.I), and is corrected and annotated in his hand; the other is in the B.L.: 581.k.5-8.

See no.11.09 for the terms on which the work was first offered for subscription.

11.11 A/ NEW METHOD/ OF STUDYING/ HISTORY,/ GEOGRAPHY,/ AND/ CHRONOLOGY./
 WITH/ A CATALOGUE of the Chief HISTORIANS/ of all Nations, the
 best EDITION of their/ Works, and Characters of them./ [rule 87mm.] /
 Written Originally in French by M. LANGUET DU/FRESNOY, Librarian to
 Prince EUGENE. And/ now made English, with Variety of Improvements/
 and Corrections./ [rule 87mm.] / To which is added,/ A DISSERTATION by
 Count SCIPIO MAFFEI/ of Verona, concerning the Use of Inscriptions/
 and Medals, by Way of Parallel./ [rule 86mm.] / In TWO VOLUMES./ [rule
 87mm.] / By RICHARD RAWLINSON, L.L.D. and F.R.S./ [rule 86mm.] / LONDON:/
 Printed for CHA. DAVIS in Pater-noster-Row./ [rule 27mm.] / M.DCC.XXX./
 T.II.

A/[...]/Parallel./ [rule...]/ VOL. II./ [rule 86mm.] / [...]

Notes: This is a re-issue of no.11.08, with a new title-page to
 replace the cancelled version: it is entirely composed of sheets from
 the 1728 printing.

Copies: Camb.U.L.: Acton.d.45.35-6; Bod.Ox.: Radcliffe 8°e.202-3.

11.12 METHODE/ POUR/ ETUDIER L'HISTOIRE,/ AVEC/ Un Catalogue des Principaux
 Historiens, & des Remarques sur la/ bonté de leurs Ouvrages, & sur
 le choix des meilleures Editions./ Par M. L'ABBE' LENGLET DU FRESNOY./
 NOUVELLE EDITION,/ Augmentée & ornée de Cartes Géographiques. [swash A]/
 TOME PREMIER. [TOME II./ TOME III./ TOME IV.]/ [Device: cul-de-lampe,
 with vase of flowers as central element; 56x65mm.] / A PARIS,/ Chez
 PIERRE GANDOUIN, Quay des Augustins, à la/ belle Image./ [rule 55mm.] /
 M. DCC. XXXV./ Avec Approbation & Privilege du Roy./

Variant imprints:

[rule...]/ M. DCC. XXXIV./ [...]

4° (257x195mm.): T.I. a⁴ (tal) b-c⁴ A-3R⁴ [3H2 signed 'Hhhhii'].

Pp.i-xxii, [2], 1-504.

T.II. a³ A-3N⁴ 3O² 3P-3Q⁴ 3R³. Pp.[6], 1-498 (misprinting 498 as '496').

T.III. a⁴ b¹ A-Q⁴, ²A-Z⁴, 2A-T⁴. Pp.[10], 1-128, 1-336.

T.IV. a³ A-2Z⁴ 3A-Y². Pp.[6], 1-452 (misprinting 202 as '102').

Production: Signs. roman 1-2. Quire catchwords.

Contents: As for no. 11.10, with a number of corrections and minor changes and additions in the text, and a new 'Avertissement du libraire' in T.I.

Copies: B.N.: Rés.G1081-4 (bound with the arms of Marie-Antoinette);

B.L.: 581.h.23; T.C.D.: Fag.v.7.

Notes: There are 11 fold-out maps in T.I, and 11 in T.II.

The title-page dated 1734 occurs in only a small number of copies; no doubt the publisher, realising that the work would not be ready for distribution until the end of that year, decided to replace it with an up-dated title-page, as he did likewise with the 12° edition (11.13). The variant title-page found in a small number of copies of no.11.10 was undoubtedly also printed at this time: the publisher must have run short of title-pages for those few copies of the 1729 edition which he had left, and used the new forme to print some extras, simply changing the date.

11.13 METHODE/ POUR ETUDIER/ L'HISTOIRE,/ AVEC/ UN CATALOGUE/ des principaux
Historiens, & des Remar-/ ques sur la bonté de leurs Ouvrages, & sur/
le choix des meilleures Editions./ Par M. L'ABBE' LENGLET DU FRESNOY./
NOUVELLE EDITION./ TOME I.[TOME II./ TOME III./ TOME IV./ TOME V./
TOME VI./ TOME VII./ TOME VIII./ TOME IX.]/[Typ. orn.]/ A PARIS,/
Chez PIERRE GANDOUIN, Quay des/ Augustins, à la belle Image.[T.VI:
'Belle']/[rule 53mm.]/ M. DCC. XXXV./ Avec Approbation & Privilege

du Roy./

Variant imprints:

T.II-IV: [.] / M. DCC. XXXIV/[.]

12° (166x95mm.): T.I. $a-d^{8-4} e^4 A-2P^{8-4} 2Q^8$. Pp.i-lvi, 1-458, [14].

T.II. $\tilde{a}^4 A-3F^{8-4} 3G^2$. Pp.[8], 1-610, [18].

T.III. $\tilde{a}^4 A-3D^{8-4} 3E^5$. Pp.[8], 1-584, [28].

T.IV. $\tilde{a}^2 A-2V^{8-4}$. Pp.[4], 1-504, [16].

T.V. $\tilde{a}^3 A-2Z^{8-4} 3A^3 3B^6 3C^4$. Pp.[6], 1-539, [39].

T.VI. $\pi^1 A-Q^{8-4} R^6, {}^2A-Z^{8-4}, 2A-I^{4-8}$. Pp.[2], 1-202, [2], 1-372, [12].

T.VII. $\tilde{a}^5 A-2P^{8-4} 2Q^4$. Pp. [10], 373-836.

T.VIII. $\pi^4 A-3C^{8-4}$. Pp. [8], 837-1428.

T.IX. $a^4 A-2E^{8-4} 2F^{10} 2G^4 2H^4 2I-3D^6 3E^4$. Pp.[8], 1429-1778, 1777*-8*, 1779-80, 1779*-80*, 1781-2030.

Production: Signs. roman 1-2, 1-4. Quire catchwords.

Contents: As for no.11.12.

Copies: B.N.:G32891-9; Maz.37657; Bod.Ox.: 8°Godw.157-65.

Notes: There are 3 fold-out maps in T.I, 3 in T.II, 5 in T.III, 13 in T.IV, 8 in T.V, and 1 in T.VI.

11.14 The National Union Catalogue attests the following edition, of which

I have not seen any copies: 'Metodo per istudiare

la storia. Scritto in lingua francese dal signor dottor Langlet di Fresnoy e trad. in lingua italiana. Venezia, appresso C. Zane, 1736.

2v. in l. 19cm. "Catalogo de principali storici": v.2, p.[1]-414.'

See also Bayerische Zentralkatalog (Munich). Cf. no. 11.18 ;

11.15 METHODE/ POUR ETUDIER/ L'HISTOIRE,/ AVEC/ UN CATALOGUE/ des
principaux Historiens, & des Remarques/ sur la bonté de leurs
Ouvrages, & sur/ le choix des meilleures Editions./ Par M. L'ABBE'
LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ NOUVELLE EDITION, [swash T]/ Faite sur la
derniere de Paris de 1735. &/ enrichie de Cartes Géographiques./
TOME I. [TOME II.-TOME V.]/ [Device: two cherubs working together,
scroll with words 'VIS UNITA MAJOR'; 33x48mm.]/ A AMSTERDAM,/ AUX DEPENS DE LA COMPAGNIE./ M. DCC. XXXVII./

12° (162x95mm.): π^1 a-n¹² o⁴ A-O¹² P⁶. Pp. [2], i-cccxx, 1-347.

T.II. π^2 A-S¹² T⁸. Pp. [4], 1-448.

T.III. π^2 A-S¹² T⁴. Pp. [4], 1-440.

T.IV. π^2 A-P¹² Q⁸. Pp. [4], 1-375.

T.V. π^2 A-S¹² T⁸. Pp. [4], 1-448.

Contents: As for no.11.13, without the Catalogue; there is a
'Catalogue des livres imprimés par la Compagnie des libraires à
Amsterdam' at the end of T.V.

Copies: *B.R.Bru.: VH.14114; Cat.Coll., Berne; Union Cat.,
Konink. Bib.

Notes: There is one fold-out map in T.I, and 3 in T.II.

11.16 SUPPLEMENT/ DE LA/ METHODE POUR ETUDIER/ L'HISTOIRE./ AVEC/ Un

Supplément au Catalogue des Historiens, & des/Remarques sur la
 bonté, & le choix de leurs Editions./ Par M. L'ABBE' LENGLET DU
 FRESNOY./ [Device: as for no.11.12]/ A PARIS,/ Chez [ornamental bracket]
 ROLLIN fils,/ DE BURE l'aîné, [close bracket] Libraires, Quay des
 Augustins./ [rule 63mm.]/ M. DCC. XXXIX./ Avec Approbation & Privilège
du Roy./

T.II.

SUPPLEMENT/ [..]/ IIe PARTIE./ Qui contient le Supplément au Cata
logue./ [Device: cul-de-lampe with miniature portrait in medallion
 at bottom, 52x56mm.]/ A PARIS,/ [..]/ [rule 63mm.]/ M. DCC. XXXIX./[..]

Variant title-pages:

T.I.

SUPPLEMENT/ [... rule...]/ M. DCC. XL./ Avec Approbation & Privilège
du Roi. /

SUPPLEMENT/[..] FRESNOY./ PREMIERE PARTIE./ [... rule...]/ M. DCC. XLI./
Avec Approbation & Privilège du Roy./

T.II.

SUPPLEMENT/[..] FRESNOY./ II. PARTIE/ [... rule 66mm.]/ M. DCC. XL./
Avec Approbation & Privilège du Roi./

SUPPLEMENT/[..] FRESNOY./ II. PARTIE./ [... rule...]/ M. DCC. XLI./ Avec
Approbation & Privilège du Roy./

4°(295x220mm.): T.I. $\tilde{a}^4 \tilde{e}^4$ A-4D⁴ 4E². Fp.i-xvi, 1-588.

T.II. a^4 A-2M⁴. Pp.i-viii, 1-280.

Production: Signs. roman 1-2. Quire catchwords.

Contents: T.I. T.-p.; pp.iii-vii, Avertissement; p.viii, Avis; pp.ix-xvi, Table; pp.1-575, Supplément...Discours I à XXXIII; pp.577-88, Table alphabétique des matières.

T.II. T.-p.; pp.iii-viii, Table; p.1, half-title; pp.3-248, Supplément pour le Catalogue des Historiens; pp.249-79, Table des Auteurs; pp.279-80, Approbation et Privilege.

Copies: B.N.: Rés.G.137-8 (de Boze copy); B.L.:216.b.14; T.C.D.:
Fag.v.5.

Notes: The Supplément was issued in small 4°, large 4°, and extra-large 4° copies, as well as in 12° format (no.11.17), to match up with all states of the 1729 and 1735 editions. The title-page was updated three times, no doubt due to delays in the projected publication date: the work finally appeared late in 1740 or early in 1741 (see announcement in Journal des savants, Feb.1741, p.128). Most copies present a mixture of dates between T.I and T.II. Some copies were bound in one volume; others introduced a break after p.434 of T.I, to make up two more evenly-matched volumes.

11.17 SUPPLEMENT/ DE LA/ METHODE POUR ETUDIER/ L'HISTOIRE./ AVEC/ Un Catalogue des Principaux Historiens,/ & des remarques sur la bonté & le/ choix de leurs Editions./ PAR/ M. L'ABBE' LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ TOME PREMIER. [TOME SECOND./ TOME TROISIE'ME./] / [Device: cul-de-lampe; 17x35mm.] / A PARIS,/ QUAY DES AUGUSTINS,/ Chez [ornamental bracket]ROLLIN fils,/ DE BURE l'aîné, [close bracket] Libraires./ [rule 44mm.] / M. DCC. XL. [T.III: 'M. DCC. XLI.']/ Avec Approbation & Privilege du Roy. [T.III: 'Roi']

12° (160x95mm.): sign.a⁸ e⁴ A-3B⁸⁻⁴. Pp.i-xxiv, 1-562, [14].

T.II. a⁴ A-3I⁸⁻⁴. Pp.i-viii, 1-664.

T.III. ~⁸ a A-D⁸⁻⁴, ² A-Z⁸⁻⁴, 2A-Z⁸⁻⁴ 3A⁴. Pp.i-xvi, 1-48, 1-560.

Production: Signs. roman 1-2, 1-4. Quire catchwords.

Contents: As for no.11,16.

Copies: B.N.: G.32900-2; *Bod. Ox.: 8°Godw.166-8; Gen.: -Ga 15.

- 11.18 Jean George Graesse affirms in his Trésor des livres rares et précieux ou Nouveau dictionnaire bibliographique, Dresden, Kuntze, 1859-69, iv, 161, that there is a 'traduction italienne par Coleti' of the Méthode, Venice, 1740, 8vol. in-8°, but I have not located any copies.
Cf. no.11.14.

- 11.19 'Anweisung zur erlernung der historie, nebst einem anjetzo vermehrten vollständigen verzeichniss der vornehmsten geschichtschreiber...Aus dem französischen übers. von P.E.B. ... Gotha, Verlegts J.P. Mevius, 1752-4. 4 v. ...17¹/₂cm. Trans. by Philipp Ernst Bertram'. Nat. Union Cat.

Copies: *Universitätsbibliothek Düsseldorf; *Univ.u.Stadtbibliothek Köln.

- 11.20 MÉTHODE/ POUR ÉTUDIER/ L'HISTOIRE,/ AVEC/ UN CATALOGUE/ DES PRINCIPAUX HISTORIENS;/ accompagné de Remarques sur la bonté/ de leurs Ouvrages, & sur le choix des/ meilleures éditions./ PAR M. L'ABBE LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ Nouvelle édition, revue, corrigée & considérablement/ augmentée, par M. DROUET, Bibliothécaire/ de MM. les Avocats, Associé libre de la Société/ des Sciences, Arts & Belles-Lettres d'Auxerre,/ & de la Société Littéraire-Militaire de Besançon./ TOME PREMIER. [TOME II-TOME XV.] / [Typ.orn.] / A PARIS,/ Chez [ornamental bracket]DEBURE, pere, à S. Paul,/ &/ N.M. TILLIARD, à S.

Benoit. [close bracket] Quai des/Augustins./[Double rule 49mm.]/
 M.DCC. LXXII./ Avec Approbation & Privilège du Roi./

Ts.II-XV:

A number of different devices replace the typ.orn. on many of the title-pages.

All t.-p.s except ts.VI, IX and XIV read 'Approbation, &'.
 Ts.III, V, VIII, XI, XIII read 'Quai des Au-/ gustins.'/.

T.IV reads 'LABBE'.

In t.X line 10 is in italics.

12°(167x95mm.): T.I.*¹² a¹² A-Z¹². Pp.i-xxiv, [24], 1-547, [4].

T.II.π² A-S¹² T⁹. Pp.[4], 1-448, 1-2.

T.III.π² a¹ A-V¹² X¹¹. Pp.i-vi, 1-502.

T.IV.π² a¹ A-2A¹² 2B⁴. Pp.i-vi, 1-583.

T.V.π² a¹ A-V¹² X⁸. Pp.i-vi, 1-496.

T.VI.π¹ a¹ A-Y¹² Z¹¹. Pp.i-iv, 1-549.

T.VII.π¹ a¹ A-Y¹². Pp.i-iv, 1-528.

T.VIII.π¹ a¹ A-T¹² V⁴. Pp.i-iv, 1-463.

T.IX.π² a² A-S¹² T⁴. Pp.i-viii, 1-439.

T.X.π⁵ A-V¹² X³. Pp.i-x, 1-486.

T.XI.π² a² A-2A¹² 2B⁸. Pp.[4], i-iv, 1-592.

T.XII.π² a¹ A-Q¹². Pp.i-vi, 1-384.

T.XIII.π² a² A-Y¹². Pp.i-viii, 1-527.

T.XIV. a⁴ A-X¹² Y¹¹. Pp.i-viii, 1-526.

T.XV. a⁴ A-2D¹² 2E². Pp.i-viii, 1-652.

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: Drouet fused together the 1735 edition of the Méthode, and the Supplément, with considerable augmentations and corrections; he re-incorporated the material contained in the cancellanda from the 1729 ed.

Copies: B.N.: G.32876-90; Ars.: 8° H 39; B.L.: 304.b.3-17.

11.21 'Méthode pour étudier l'histoire, avec un catalogue des principaux historiens ... Amst. 1781. 5 v. in-12', listed in the Catalogue collectif de la Suisse, Berne; I have not found any other references to this edition.

12.01 COMMENTAIRE/ DE M. DUPUY/ SUR LE TRAITE' DES LIBERTEZ/ DE/ L'EGLISE GALLICANE/ DE M. PIERRE PITHOU, Avocat en la Cour de Parlement./ AVEC TROIS AUTRES TRAITEZ./ I. De l'origine & du progrès des Interdits Ecclesiastiques. II. Des Informations de vie & moeurs des nommez aux Evechez par le Roy. III. L'Histoire de l'origine/ de la Pragmatique Sanction du Roy Charles VII. & des Concordats./ NOUVELLE EDITION/

Revuë, corrigée & augmentée de Notes, & d'une Preface Historique,
 dans laquelle/ on donne la maniere d'étudier le Droit Canonique, par
 rapport aux usages du/ Royaume; & l'on fait connoître les Livres les
 plus nécessaires pour cette Science./ Avec un Receüil de Preuves, qui
contient les Pragmatiques & le Concordat; les Edits, / Declarations
& Ordonnances des Roys de France sur la Discipline Ecclesiastique./
 TOME I. [TOME II.] / [Device: as in 11.01, variant imprint] / A PARIS,
 Chez JEAN MUSIER, Libraire, à la descente du Pont Neuf, / au coin de
 la ruë de Nevers, à l'Olivier. / [rule 61mm.] / M. DCC. XV. / AVEC
APPROBATION ET PRIVILEGE DU ROY. [swash T, U, Y] /

4° (285x205mm.): $\tilde{a}^4 \tilde{e}^4 \tilde{i}^4 \tilde{o}^4 \tilde{u}^4 2\tilde{a}^4 2\tilde{e}^4 2\tilde{i}^4 2\tilde{o}^4 2\tilde{u}^4 3\tilde{a}^4 3\tilde{e}^4 A^4$
 $B^4 (\pm B3,4) C^4 (\pm C3,4) D^4 (\pm D1,2) E^4 F^4 (\pm F2) G^4 (\pm G2) H^4 (\pm H2) I^4 (\pm I2.3)$
 $K^4 L^4 (\pm L2,4) M^4 (\pm M3) N^4 (\pm N3) O-P^4 Q^4 (\pm Q3.4) R^4 (\pm R4) S^4 T^4 (\pm T3) U^4$
 $X^4 Y^4 (\pm Y2) Z-2C^4 a-u^4 x^4 (\pm x1.4) y^4 (\pm y1,3) z^4 (\pm z3) 2a^4 (\pm a1) 2b^4 (\pm b2)$
 $2c^4 (\pm c2) 2d^4 (\pm d1) 2e-f^4 2g^2 2h^2 2i^4$ [f3 signed 'fii']. Pp.i-lxxxvii,
 [9], 1-208, 1-236, [14].
 T.II. $\tilde{a}^4 \tilde{e}^4 \tilde{i}^4 A-2A^4 2B^4 (-2B1,2; +2B1) 2C-4G^4 4H^2$ [A2 signed 'A'].
 Pp. [24], 1-196, 199-612.

Production: Signs. roman 1-2. Catchwords only at end of sections.

Contents: T.I. Half-title; p.iii, t.-p.; p.iv, Quotation 'Baldus
 III...'; pp.v-viii, A Monseigneur Voysin Chancelier de France; pp.ix
 -lxxxvii, Preface historique; sign.384-381, Avertissement au lecteur

(de M. Dupuy); sign.3ē1, Au Roy Tres-chrestien; sign.3ē2, Extrait des Registres, & Privilege du Roy; sign.3ē3, Approbation & Privilege du Roy; sign.3ē4, Table des titres; pp.1-208, Commentaire sur le Traité des Libertez; p.1, half-title; pp.3-17, De l'origine et du progrez des interdicts ecclesiastiques; p.19, half-title; pp.20-39, Memoire pour faire voir que les informations de vie & moeurs...; p.41, half-title; pp.43-122, Histoire contenant l'origine de la pragmatique sanction et des concordats; p.123, half-title; pp.125-236, Catalogue des principaux canonistes; sign.2g2-h2, Table...des auteurs; sign.2i1-i4, Table des matieres; sign.2i4, Corrections.

T.II. T.-p.; Quotation 'Sanctus Augustinus...'; sign.ā2-ī4, Table des Edits; p.1, half-title; pp.3-612, Preuves pour le Commentaire; sign.4H1-H2, Table des matieres.

Copies: B.N.:Rés.4°Ld¹⁰12A; Ars.: 4°J 747 and 4°J 748; B.L.: 14.b.16-17.

Notes: The 'Preface historique' was suppressed by order of the Procureur Général, Daguesseau (see Chapter III, pp.108-9), but Lenglet was evidently given tacit permission to publish it: it is bound into all the copies I have seen. Lenglet did, however, write an alternative 'Avertissement', 6 pages signed ā1-ā3, which was also bound into a large number of copies. A ms. note in Lenglet's hand in the B.N. Réserve copy reads: 'Avertissement substitué par ordre de M. le Procureur general, au lieu de la grande preface qu'il a fait supprimer'.

A large number of changes likewise had to be made in the body of the text: some were ordered by Daguesseau, others by the Chancellor under whom the royal censors operated; these necessitated the printing of cartons (or cancellantia) to replace the original leaves (cancellanda). All the cancellanda are bound at the back of the B.N. Rés. copy, and classified in Lenglet's own hand according to the author of their suppression. The following are the pages corrected by order of the Chancellor:

T.I (1st series): pp.13/14, 15/16, 21/2, 23/4, 25/6, 27/8, 51/2, 59/60, 83/4, 87/8, 125/6, 149/50.

Pages corrected by order of the Procureur Général:

T.I(1st series):21/2, 43/4, 51/2, 67/8, 69/70, 93/4, 101/2, 127/8,

135/6, 149/50, 171/2. Catalogue: pp.163/4, 169/70, 171/2, 175/6, 183/4, 187/8, 197/8, 205/6, 211/2.

In addition pp.196-8 of t.II were suppressed, and replaced by one leaf numbered 195/8 (in one of the copies I have seen it was numbered 195/6: this was presumably an early proof to which a stop-press correction was made).

The number of cancellanda present in extant copies is subject to wide variation: in the B.N. Rés. copy the original pages were removed and replaced by cancellantia, but the cancellanda are bound in at the back; a second B.N. copy contains no cancellanda, whereas in Ars.:4°J 748 almost all the original pages were preserved in the text, and a large number of cancellantia bound in at the back. The amount of uncensored material left intact in any copy was undoubtedly related to the wealth or position of the buyer, although other factors also affected the composition of the volumes. In addition, the original pages, having been excised from a large number of copies, were then sold separately to clients who could have them bound into the copy they had acquired. This procedure was to be carried to a high degree of sophistication in the marketing of the 1729 edition of the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire:cf. Appendix

13.01 METHODE/ POUR ETUDIER/ LA GEOGRAPHIE;/ DANS LAQUELLE ON/ donne une
Description exacte de l'Uni-/ vers, tirée des meilleurs Auteurs, &/
formée sur les Observations de Messieurs/ de l'Academie Royale des
Sciences./ AVEC/ UN DISCOURS PRELIMINAIRE [swash U twice]/ sur l'Etude
de cette science, & un Catalo-/ gue des Cartes Geographiques, des
Rela-/ tions, Voyages, & Descriptions les plus/ nécessaires pour la
Geographie./ TOME I./ [Typ.orn.]/ A PARIS,/ Chez CHARLES ESTIENNE
HOCHEREAU,/ au Phenix, Quay des Augustins./ [rule 65mm.]/ M. DCCXVI./
Avec Approbation & Privilege du Roy./

T.II.

METHODE/ [..]/ sur l'étude de [..]/ TOME II./[..]/[rule 62mm.]/ [..]

T.III.

METHODE/ [..]/ sur l'étude de [..]/ TOME III./ [..]

T.IV.

METHODE/ POUR ETUDIER/ LA GEOGRAPHIE./ DANS LAQUELLE ON DONNE/ une
Description exacte de l'Univers, tirée/ des meilleurs Auteurs, &
formée sur les/Observations de Messieurs de l'Académie/ Royale des

Sciences./ AVEC/ UN DISCOURS PRELIMINAIRE [swash U twice]/ sur
l'étude de cette science, & un Cata-/ logue des Cartes Geographiques;
des Re-/ lations, Voyages, & Descriptions les plus/ nécessaires pour
la Geographie./ TOME IV./ Qui contient l'ancienne Geographie./ [...]/
[rule 6lmm.]/ M. DCC XVI./ [...]

12° (159x94mm.): T.I. $\bar{a}^3 \bar{e}^8 \bar{i}^4 \bar{o}^8 \bar{u}^4 2\bar{a}^8 2\bar{e}^4 2\bar{i}^8 2\bar{o}^4 2\bar{u}^8 3\bar{a}^4 3\bar{e}^8$
 $3\bar{i}^4 3\bar{o}^8 3\bar{u}^4 A-2N^{8-4} 2O^4 2P - Q^6$. Pp. [6], i-cxxxvi, [32], 1-432,
 [32].

T.II. $a-b^{8-4} A-2P^{8-4} 2Q^6, 2O^2, 2R - T^6 2V^4$ [L3 signed 'Liv';
 $2O^1$ signed 'Ooiii']. Pp. [24], 1-458, [58].

T.III. $a^8 b^2 A-3C^{8-4} 3D^3$. Pp. [20], 1-582.

T.IV. $\bar{a}^8 \bar{e}^4 A-I^{8-4} K^1, 2A^3 2B-2B^{8-4} 2C-H^6$. Pp. [24], 1-114, 1-282,
 [84].

Production: Signs. roman 1-2, 1-4. Quire catchwords.

Contents: T.I. T.-p.; sign. $\bar{a}2-\bar{a}3$, A Monsieur le Duc de Chartres;
 pp.i-cxxxvi, Discours sur l'etude de la geographie; sign. $3\bar{i}1$, Table
 des Articles contenus dans le Discours précédent; sign. $3\bar{i}2-\bar{u}2$, Table
 Des Chapitres...du Tome I; sign. $3\bar{u}3-\bar{u}4$, Approbation...Privilege;
 pp.1-432, Methode..., [Livres I-II]; sign. $2O1-Q6$, Table des Matieres.
 T.II. T.-p.; sign. $a2-b2$, Table Des Chapitres...du Tome II; sign. $b3-$
 $b4$, Approbation...Privilege; pp.1-458, Methode..., [Livres II-III];
 sign. $2Q2-V3$, Table des Matieres; sign. $2V4$, Fautes a corriger.
 T.III. T.-p.; sign. $\bar{a}2-b1$, Table des Chapitres ...du Tome III; pp.1-
 328, Methode..., [Livres IV-V]; p.329, half-title; pp.331-2, Avertisse-
 ment; pp.333-435, Catalogue des principaux livres de la geographie;
 p.437, half-title; pp.439-552, Catalogue des Meilleures cartes...;

pp.553-82, Table des auteurs.

T.IV. T.-p.; sign.ã2-ã6, Avertissement; sign.ã7-ẽ4, Table des articles du Tome IV; pp.1-282, Methode... [Livres VII-VIII]; sign.2A7-2H6, Table des matieres.

Copies: B.N.: G.10525-8; Maz.: 30521 et A-C.

Notes: There is an engraved frontispiece and 8 maps in T.1; 5 maps in T.11; 3 in T111.

T.I-III were published together before August 1716, and T.IV was issued some short time later (Les Nouvelles littéraires, iv (1716), p.157).

This work was a plagiarisation of the Nouvelle géographie, ou description exacte de l'Univers tirée des meilleurs auteurs, published by D. Martineau du Plessis in 1700 (cf. Chapter III, pp.111ff.)

Lenglet asserted that : 'On a mis le nom de M. Martineau à plus de la moitié des exemplaires de la nouvelle édition de Paris' (Nouvelles littéraires, vii (1718), 45); I have not seen any such copy.

Lenglet's own name did not actually appear in the edition, but the privilege designated 'le Sieur A** L** D** F**' as the author of the work.

13.02 Méthode pour étudier la géographie, Amsterdam, 1718, 4 vols. 12°.

This was apparently a counterfeit edition of 13.01. See Nat.

Union Cat.; *B.R. Brux.: V.B.7508; *Konink. Bib.: 655 N 16-19.

13.03 METHODE/ POUR ETUDIER/ LA GEOGRAPHIE./ OU L'ON DONNE UNE/ Description exacte de l'Univers, formée/ sur les Observations de l'Academie Royale/ des Sciences./ AVEC/ UN DISCOURS PRELIMINAIRE SUR [swash A]/ l'étude de cette Science, & un Catalogue des Cartes/ Geographiques, des Relations, Voyages, & Des-/ criptions les plus nécessaires pour la Geographie./ Par M. l'Abbé LENGLET DUFRESNOY. [swash A]/ TOME I.

[TOME II.-IV.]/[Typ.orn.]/ A PARIS,/ Quay des Augustins, du côté du
 Pont/ Saint Michel./ Chez [ornamental bracket enclosing 2 lines]
 ROLLIN fils, à S. Athanase./ DE BURE l'aîné, à S.Paul/ [rule 62mm.]/
 M. DCC. XXXVI./ Avec Approbation & Privilege du Roy. [swash A twice]/
 T.V.
 METHODE/ [..]/ TOME V./ Qui contient l'Ancienne Geographie./ [..]

12°(165x98mm.): $a^9, {}^2a-o^{8-4}, A-2E^{8-4} 2F^1$. Pp.i-xiv, [4], i-clxviii,
 1-318, [20].

T.II. $a^5 A-2I^{8-4} 2K^6$. Pp.i-x, 1-372, [24].

T.III. $a^4 A-2N^{8-4} 2O^4 2P^2 2Q^4 2R^2 2S^3$. Pp.i-viii, 1-432, [30].

T.IV. $a^6 A-2T^{8-4}$. Pp.i-xii, 1-488, [16].

T.V. $a^8 b^4 c^2. A-2A^{8-4} 2B^4 2C-O^{4-2}, {}^2A-S^{8-4}, T^6 V^4$. Pp.i-xxviii,
 1-282, [86], 1-236.

Production: Signs. roman 1-4, 1-2. Quire catchwords.

Contents: As for 13.01, with a number of changes and additions, of
 which the most significant is 'La géographie des enfants' (Livre I)
 which was also issued separately: cf. no.30.01 .

Copies: B.N.: G.10529-33; Ars.: 8°H 88; B.L.:569.c.15-19.

Notes: Frontispiece and maps as in 13.01.

13.04 Metodo per istudiare la geografia, Venezia, S. Coletti, 1740,
 4 vols., 16cm. In Bib. Vat.; Chigi v. 2617, Copia 2.

13.05 GEOGRAPHIA/ ANTIQUA ET NOVA / OR A/ SYSTEM/ OF/ ANTIENT
and MODERN/ GEOGRAPHY,/ WITH A/ SETT of MAPS Engraven from
CELLARIUS'S./ DESIGNED FOR/ The Use of SCHOOLS, and of GENTLEMEN,
who make/ the ANTIENTWRITERS their Delight or Study./ Translated
from the French of Mr. L'ABBE' DU FRESNOY, with [swash Y]/ great
Additions and Improvements, from PTOLEMY, STRABO/ CELLARIUS, &c./
To which is added a Large INDEX./ LONDON: Printed for JOHN and
PAUL KNAPTON, at the Crown in Ludgate-Street./ MDCCXLII./

4°(280x200mm.): A⁴ (a)² B-2B⁴ 2C². Pp.i-vi, [6], 1-158, 1-38.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-2. Catchwords on every page. Contains
press-figures.

Contents: This edition is loosely based on no. 13.03, 'improved
with great Additions from Ptolemy ... etc.'

Copies: B.L.: 793.i.2 and 216. a.3;*Camb.U.L.

Notes: There are 33 maps numbered I-XXXIII. Cf. no. 13.08 below.

13.06 METHODE/ POUR ETUDIER/ LA GEOGRAPHIE./ OÙ L'ON DONNE UNE/ Description
exacte de l'Univers, formée sur/ les Observations de l'Académie
Royale des/ Sciences, & sur les Auteurs originaux./ AVEC/ UN DISCOURS
PRELIMINAIRE SUR/ l'étude de cette Science, & un Catalogue des/ Cartes
Geographiques, Relations, Voyages, &/ Descriptions nécessaires pour
la Géographie./ PAR M. L'ABBE' LENGLET DUFRESNOY./ Troisième
Edition./ TOME PREMIER. [TOME PREMIER./ SECONDE PARTIE./ TOME II.-
VII.]/ [Typ.orn.]/ A PARIS,/ Quay des Augustins./ Chez [ornamental

bracket enclosing 2 lines] ROLLIN fils, à S. Athanase./ DE BURE
l'aîné, à S. Paul./ [rule 65mm.] / M. DCC. XLII./ Avec Approbation
& Privilege du Roi./

Ts.III-VI are dated 'M. DCC. XLI.', and there is no accent on the 'OU'
in line 4.

12°(166x90mm.): $\pi^2 e^{11} A-N^{12} O^{10}$. Pp. i-xxvi, 1-330, [2].

T.I, Part 2. $\pi^4 P-Y^{12} Z^8 {}^2A-K^{12} L^6$. Pp. [2], 331-4, [2], 335-542, 1-
252.

T.II. $\tilde{a}^8 A-2A^{12} 2B^4$. Pp.i-xvi, 1-584.

T.III. $\tilde{a}^8 A-2D^{12} 2E^8$. Pp.i-xvi, 1-664.

T.IV. $a^{12} A-2G^{12} 2H^6$. Pp.i-xxiv, 1-732.

T.V. $\tilde{a}^6 A-2E^{12} 2F^2$. Pp.i-xii, 1-676.

T.VI. $a^{12} A-2F^{12} 2G^3$. Pp.i-xxiv, 1-701.

T.VII. $a^8 A-2D^{12} 2E^4$. Pp.i-xvi, 1-656.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: As for 13.03, with corrections based on recent peace
treaties and further augmentations.

Copies: B.N.:G.10534-41; Ars.:8°H.89; T.C.D.: Fag.A.10.25-32.

Notes: Lenglet and his publishers failed to present this edition
to the censor appointed to examine it (the abbé Souchay), but
simply reprinted the 1735 approbation by the abbé Raguet (cf.
P.-M. de Gourné, Requête...relativement aux attaques dont le
'Géographe méthodique' a été l'objet, n.p., n.d., pp.3-4).
Frontispiece and maps as in 13.01.

13.07 Catalogue des meilleures cartes géographiques générales et particulières... (Reprint of 13.06, T.I, Part2), Amsterdam, Meridian Publ., 1965, 252pp.

13.08 Geographia Antiqua et Nova:/OR A/ SYSTEM/ OF/ Antient and Modern GEOGRAPHY./ WITH A/ SET OF MAPS,/ ENGRAVEN FROM THOSE OF/ CELLARIUS,/ DESIGNED FOR/ The Use SCHOOLS, and of GENTLEMEN, who make the/ ANTIENT WRITERS their Delight or Study./ Translated from the French of Mr. L'ABBE' DU FRESNOY, with/ great Additions and Improvements, from PTOLEMY, STRABO,/ CELLARIUS, &c./ To which is added a Large INDEX./ THE SECOND EDITION./ The whole, together with the Maps, corrected and improved./ LONDON./ Printed for ROBERT HORSFIELD, at N°.22, in Ludgate-Street./ MDCCLXVIII./

4° (252x230mm.) π^1 A-O⁴ P-Z² 2A². Pp.i-iv, [6], 1-106, [38].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-2. Catchwords on every page. Contains pressfigures.

Contents: As for 13.05, including the maps.

Copies: B.L.:R.Horsfield.10001.g.1; *Trinity Coll. Camb.:U.4.72.

13.09 MÉTHODE/ POUR ÉTUDIER/ LA GEOGRAPHIE;/ OÙ l'on donne une Description exacte de/ l'Univers, formée sur les Observations/ de l'Académie Royale des Sciences, &/ sur les Auteurs originaux./ AVEC/ Un Discours préliminaire sur l'Etude de cette/ Science, & un Catalogue des Cartes, relations, Voyages & Descriptions nécessaires/ pour la Géographie./ Par M. l'Abbé LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ QUATRIÈME ÉDITION,/

Revue, corrigée & augmentée./ TOME PREMIER. [TOME II.-TOME X.]/
 [Typ.orn.]/ A PARIS,/ Chez N.M. TILLIARD, Libraire, Quai des/
 Augustins, à Saint Benoît./ [Double rule 61mm.]/ M. DCC. LXVIII./
Avec Approbation & Privilège du Roi./

Ts.II-VI and IX-X: read 'l'Etude' without the accent.

Ts.IX-X: line 'Avec Approbation...' missing.

12° (168x95mm.): $\pi^2 a^4 b^3 A-2B^{12} 2C^8$. Pp.i-xviii, 1-616.

T.II. $a^6 A-2B^{12}$. Pp.i-xii, 1-598, [2b1.].

T.III. $\pi^2 A-2B^{12}$. Pp.[4], 1-600.

T.IV. $\pi^2 A-2C^{12} 2D^8$. Pp.[4], 1-638, [2b1.].

T.V. $a^5 A-V^{12} X^4$. Pp.i-x, 1-486, [2b1.].

T.VI. $a^4 A-2A^{12}$. Pp.i-viii, 1-576.

T.VII. $a^4 A-T^{12} V^6$. Pp.i-viii, 1-468.

T.VIII. $a^6 A-2A^{12} 2B^5$. Pp.i-xii, 1-586.

T.IX. $a^4 A-S^{12} T^4$. Pp.i-viii, 1-440.

T.X. $a^2 A-P^{12}$. Pp.i-iv, 1-360.

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. No catchwords.

Contents: Greatly augmented edition of 13.06, based partly on the manuscript notes prepared by Lenglet before his death in 1755; the 'Géographie des enfants' and the maps have been omitted.

Copies: B.N.:G.10558-67; Ars.:8°H 90; B.L.:304.b.18-27.

14.01 LE/ CABINET/ SATYRIQUE/ OU/ RECUEIL/ DE/ VERS PIQUANS & GAILLARDS/
TIRE'S DES CABINETS/ Des Sieurs de Sigognes, Regnier, Motin,
Berthelot, Maynard, & autres des/ plus signalez Poètes./ TOME I.
[TOME II.]/ [Device: cul-de-lampe, 22x29mm.]/ Au MONT PARNASSE./ De
l'imprimerie de meſſer Apollon./ L'année ſatyrique./ [rule 68mm.]/

12°(142x88mm.): A-P¹² (F4 signed 'F5'; M3 signed 'L3'). Pp.1-350,
[10].

T.II. A-O¹² P⁶ (C4 signed 'C5'). Pp.1-340, [8].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-7. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: P.1, t.-p.; p.2, Vous qui cherchez...; pp.3-350, Le
Cabinet satyrique; sign. P8-P12, Table.

T.II. P.1; t.-p.; pp.3-340, Le Cabinet...; sign.P3-P6, Table.

Copies; B.N.: Enfer 1128; Maz.: 36798; B.L.: 240.b.16-17.

Notes: The typographical features of this work suggest that it
was printed in Holland, as were the other editions of the French
poets which Lenglet published in the early 1730 s.

The date generally ascribed to the edition is c.1720 (cf.p.121)
but it is nonetheless possible that it was published nearer to
1730.

Some copies are bound in one volume.

15.01 SUPPLEMENT/ AUX/ OEUVRES/ DE/ Mr. ROUSSEAU. [swash U twice]/ Contenant
les Pieces que l'Auteur a rejet-/ tées de ſon Edition./ Donnée au
Public par Mr. D./ [Arrangement of typ.orns., 21x21mm.]/ A LONDRES,/
De l'Imprimerie de JACOB TONSON &/ JEAN WATTS./ [rule 36mm.]/ M DCC
XXIII./

12°(167x96mm.): A-G¹². Pp.1-166, [2b1.].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-7. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: P.1, t.-p.; pp.3-4, Avis de l'Editeur; pp.5-106, La Mandragore, Comedie; pp.107-25, Poesies; pp.127-64, Epigrammes; pp.165-6, 'ΕΙΔΥΛΛΙΟΝ.

Copies: B.N.: Rés.Ye 2353; Ye 9026.

Notes: The typographical features would suggest a Dutch or Belgian origin for this edition; it is very probably the first edition, which was copied in London (cf. Chapter III, pp.139-40.)

15.02 SUPPLEMENT/ AUX/ OEUVRES/ DE/ Mr. ROUSSEAU./ Contenant les Pieces que l'Auteur a rejettées/ de son Edition./ Donné au Public par Mr. D./ [Device: fleuron, 13x34mm.]/ A LONDRES:/ De l'Imprimerie de JACOB TONSON &/ JEAN WATTS./ [rule 34mm.]/ M DCC XXIII./

12°(161x89mm.): A-G¹² H¹. Pp.1-170.

Production: Signs. arabic, 1-5. Catchwords on every page; Press figures.

Contents: As for 15.01.

Copies: B.L.: 1065 e 33; Bod.Ox.: Vet. A4. f. 1201.

Notes: This edition may well have been 'pirated' by the very publishers whose name figured on the title-page of 15.01, although the possibility that Lenglet sold the manuscript directly to the English publishers cannot be ruled out.

This Supplément was reprinted in many subsequent editions of Rousseau's Oeuvres.

- 16.01 'Défense de M. le Blanc', c.1724, '50 pages grand in-4°, bien imprimé' (cf. Mathieu Marais, Correspondance, iii, 569).

I have not located any copies of this work; it appears to have been printed in a very small edition, as Marais affirms that 'Il a été fort peu vu et a été donné à peu de gens dans le temps du procès'. Cf. Chapter III, p144.

- 17.01 [Engraved sheet, with title at top:]

TABLES/ CHRONOLOGIQUES DE L'HISTOIRE/ UNIVERSELLE/ PAR M. l'Abbé Lenglet-du-Frénoy./

[and enclosed in decorative border at bottom of sheet:]

A PARIS/ Chez PIERRE GANDOUIN, Quay des/ Augustins, à la belle Image. 1729./

[Signed at bottom of sheet:] Desbrustins Scrip.

2°(650x950mm.): 4 ff. (double).

Contents: 'Iere Table' and 'IIe Table', [Histoire ancienne]; 'IIIe Table' and 'IVe Table', [Histoire moderne].

Copies: B.N.: G.182; Ars.: Gr.Fol.256; B.L.: 747.c.22(2).

Notes: The sheets were . designed so that they could be displayed on the wall, Table I above Table II, and Table III above Table IV. See the Prospectus to the Méthode pour étudier l'histoire (1728): the Tables were offered for subscription for 6 livres, the price being fixed at 12 livres for non-subscribers.

17.02 [Engraved sheet, with title as for 17.01; colophon at bottom of sheet:]

A Paris rue St Jacques Nouvelle edition, augmentée M. DCC. XXXIII.
Chez Osmont et Briasson.

2° (645x900mm.) 4ff. (double).

Contents: As for 17.01, with minor additions.

Copies: Bibl. Municipale de Lille: Histoire 328.

17.03 The Catalogues of the Bay. Staats. and the Stadtbibliothek Trier record an edition of the 'Tables chronologiques..., Nouvelle édition augmentée, Paris, Gandouin, 1733'. This may have been printed from the same plate as 17.02, with the name of the publisher only being changed: presumably it was Gandouin, the original publisher, who still held the privilège.

17.04 'Tables chronologiques de l'histoire universelle, sacrée et profane, par M. Lenglet Dufresnoy; en 4 grandes feuilles gravées en taille douce, et imprimées sur papier grand aigle. Nouvelle édition, continuée jusqu'à l'année 1767. A Paris, chez Debure, père, & Tilliard, Libraires, quai des Augustins: prix 6 liv.' (Le Mercure, Jan. 1768, ii, 172-3). I have not located any copies of this edition.

17.05 'Tables chronologiques de l'histoire Universelle. Nouvelle édition ...Paris, 1775. 4bldn.plano.' Konink.Bib.: 1055.E2.1-4; Zentral-katalog Baden-Württemberg.

17.06 'Tables chronologiques de l'histoire universelle. Nouvelle édition ...Paris, 1776. 4 bldn. plano.' Konink.Bib.: WI.A34.43-6.

18.01 DESCRIPTION/ DE LA FESTE/ ET/ DU FEU D'ARTIFICE/ Qui doit être
tiré à Paris, sur la Riviere,/ AU SUJET DE LA NAISSANCE/ DE
MONSEIGNEUR LE DAUPHIN,/ PAR ORDRE DE SA MAJESTE' CATHOLIQUE/
PHILIPPE V./ Et par les soins de Leurs Excellences M. le Marquis
de SANTA-CRUZ/ & M. DE BARRENECHEA, Ambassadeurs Extraordinaires,/
& Plenipotentiaires du Roy d'Espagne./ Le XXI. Janvier M. DCC.
XXX./ [Device: cul-de-lampe with canopy and foliage, 40x72mm.] /
A PARIS,/ Chez PIERRE GANDOUIN, Quay des Augustins,/ à la belle
Image./ [rule 69mm.] / M. DCC. XXX./ AVEC PERMISSION./

4° (278x205mm.): A-D⁴. Pp.1-31.

Production: Signs. roman 1-2. Quire catchwords.

Contents: P.1, t.-p.; pp.3-31, Description; p.31, Permission.

Copies: B.N.: Estampes Pd 80 4°; Lb³⁸ 366.

Notes: There are 3 fold-out engraved illustrations (cf. Henri Cohen,
Guide de l'amateur de livres à gravures du XVIIIe siècle, Paris,
Rouquette, 1912, p.622).

18.02 [Device: coat of arms, 44x123mm.] / DESCRIPTION/ DE LA FESTE/ ET DU
FEU D'ARTIFICE,/ QUI doit être tiré sur la Riviere, au sujet de la
Naissance/ de Monseigneur LE DAUPHIN, par ordre de Sa Ma-/ jesté
Catholique PHILIPPE V./ ET par les soins de leurs Excellences MM.
le Marquis/ de Santa-Cruz & de Barrenechea, Ambassadeurs Ex-/
traordinaires, & Plenipotentiaires du Roi d'Espagne./ Le 24.

Janvier 1730./ [Text from/ L'HOTEL...con-/].

4°(253x190mm.): π^4 . Pp.1-8.

Production: Signs. roman 1-2.

Contents: Pp.1-8, Description.

Copies: B.N.: Lb³⁸ 367; Maz.: A15384 (no.51).

Notes: This is an abridged version of 18.01, without the illustrations. It was obviously published due to the change in the date of the 'fête'. The colophon on the last page reads 'A Paris, chez la Veuve Mergé, rue S. Jacques, au Coq'.

19.01 LA/ CATANOISE,/ OU [swash U]/ HISTOIRE SECRETE/ Des Mouvements arrivez
au Royaume/ de Naples, sous la Reine Jeanne I./ [Device: cul-de-lampe
with decorative canopies, 36x54mm.] / A PARIS,/ Chez PIERRE GANDOUIN,
Quay/ des Augustins, à la Belle Image./ [rule 56mm.] / M. DCC. XXXI./
Avec Approbation & Privilège du Roi.

12°(165x90mm.): π^3 A-2C⁸⁻⁴ 2D⁴ 2E². Pp.[6], 1-324.

Production: Signs. roman 1-4, 1-2. Quire catchwords.

Contents: T.-p.; sign. π 2-3, Approbation... Privilege; pp.1-324,
Histoire de la Catanoise.

Copies: B.N.: Y² 6719; Ste.Gen.: Δ 51.987.Rés.(bound with the Condé
arms); B.L.: 10631.aa.25.

Notes: The approbation for this work was signed in 1728; there was a review published in the first quarter of the year 1731, so presumably the volume was issued at the start of that year.

20.01 OEUVRES/ DE/ CLEMENT MAROT/ VALET-DE-CHAMBRE DE FRANÇOIS I. ROY DE

 FRANCE,/ Revûes sur plusieurs Manuscrits, & sur plus de quarante
Editions;/ ET AUGMENTE'ES/ Tant de diverses Poëxies veritables,

que de celles qu'on lui a fausëment attribuëes;/ AVEC/ Les Ouvrages
 de JEAN MAROT son Pere,/ ceux de MICHEL MAROT son Fils,/ & les

 Pièces du Different de CLEMENT avec FRANÇOIS SAGON:/ Accompagnées

d'une Preface Historique & d'Observations Critiques./ TOME PREMIER.
[TOME SECOND. / TOME TROISIEME. / TOME QUATRIEME.] /
[Engraving: bust of Marot being crowned by cherubs, 69x64mm.]/ A LA
HAYE,/ Chez P. GOSSE & J. NEAULME./ M. DCC. XXXI./ [rule 56mm.]/
Avec Privilege des Etats de Hollande & de West-Frise./

Ts.II-IV: There is a rule (56mm.) after '...NEAULME./'.

4° (299x223mm.): * -***⁴ A-C⁴ (±C4) D-4E⁴. Pp.i-xxiv, 1-592.

T.II. * -***⁴ A-4D⁴. Pp.i-xxiv, 1-584.

T.III.*⁴ A-4B⁴ 4C². Pp.i-viii, 1-572.

T.IV. * -***⁴ A-4C⁴. Pp.i-xxiv, 1-572, [2].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-3. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: T.I. T.-p.; pp.iii-x, A Son Excellence Monseigneur le Comte Hoym; pp.xi-xvii, Liste des Pieces Particulieres à cette Edition; pp.xviii-xx, Liste des Editions principales des Oeuvres de Clement Marot; pp.xxi-ii, Distribution de la nouvelle Edition; p.xxiii, Clement Marot a son livre; p.xxiv, Epitaphe de Clement

Marot; pp.1-116, Preface historique sur les Oeuvres ...; pp.117-22, Abregé de la vie de Clement Marot; pp.123-276, Les Oeuvres... Opusculs; pp.277-356, Elegies; pp.357-587, Epitres; pp.588-92, Table.

T.II. P.i, t.-p.; pp.iii-xxiv, Table; pp.1-30, Les Oeuvres... Ballades; pp.31-99, Chants divers; pp.100-34, Chansons; pp.135-200, Rondeaux; pp.201-385, Epigrammes; pp.386-410, Estrennes; pp.411-25, Epitaphes; pp.426-51, Cimetiere; pp.452-96, Complainctes; pp.497-502, Oraison; pp.503-84, Blasons...Faits à l'imitation de Clement Marot.

T.III. P.i, t.-p.; pp.iii-viii, Table; pp.1-387, Oeuvres... [Diverses]; pp.389-450, Poesies attribue'es a Clement Marot; pp.451-76, Avertissements et Prefaces tirées des differentes Editions; pp.477-90, Autres petites pieces, faites à l'imitation de Clement Marot, ou a son sujet; pp.491-522, Poësies nouvelles pour les deux premiers Tomes; pp.523-57, Liste alphabetique des anciens Termes...; pp.558-72, Table des matieres.

T.IV. P.i, t.-p.; p.iii, half-title; pp.v-xi, Table; pp.xii-xxi, Remarques sur la personne et les ouvrages de Jean Marot; pp.xxii-iv, Chronologie; pp.1-2, Extrait des origines de Caen; pp.3-356, Poesies de Jean Marot; pp.357-70, Les Poësies de Michel Marot; pp.371-572, Recueil des Pieces du differend entre Clement Marot, François Sagon & la Hueterie; sign. 4C4, Privilegie.

Copies: B.N.: Rés.Ye 50-3; B.L.:85.h.1; T.C.D.: Fag.C.2.46-9.

Notes: There is an engraved frontispiece, featuring a portrait of Marot. The pages of text are printed within a frame of typographical ornaments.

Some copies were printed on extra-large paper.

The Dedication is signed: 'Le Chevalier Gordon de Percel. De Bruxelles ce 20 octobre 1730'; the earliest reviews date from the first quarter of the following year.

20.02 OEUVRES/ DE/ CLEMENT MAROT/ VALET-DE-CHAMBRE DE FRANÇOIS I. / ROY

 DE FRANCE,/ Revûes sur plusieurs Manuscrits, & sur plus/ de
quarante Editions;/ ET AUGMENTE^{ES}/ Tant de diverses Poësies
veritables, que de celles/ qu'on lui a fausèlement attribuées:/ AVEC/
 Les Ouvrages de JEAN MAROT son Pere,/ ceux de MICHEL MAROT son Fils,/
 & les Pièces du Different de CLEMENT avec/ FRANÇOIS SAGON:/
Accompagnées d'une Preface Historique &/ d'Observations Critiques./
 TOME PREMIER. [TOME SECOND./ TOME TROISIEME./ TOME QUATRIEME./ TOME

 CINQUIEME./ TOME SIXIEME.] / [Typ.orns.] / A LA HAYE,/ Chez P. GOSSE
 & J. NEAULME./ M.DCC.XXXI./ [rule 28mm.] / Avec Privilege des Etats
de Hollande & de West-Frise./

12°(153x86mm.): *¹² A-R¹². Pp.i-xxiv, 1-406, [2].

T.II.*⁸ A-R¹² S¹⁰ [G5 signed 'G6']. Pp.i-xvi, 1-428.

T.III.*¹² A-Q¹² R³. Pp.i-xxiv, 1-389.

T.IV.*⁴ A-Q¹² R². Pp.i-viii, 1-387.

T.V.*¹² A-Q¹² R⁴. Pp.i-xxiv, 1-392.

T.VI.*⁴ A-P¹² Q⁴ (*)³. Pp.i-viii, 1-368, [6].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-7. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: As in 20.01, which was issued simultaneously; the order of some of the sections has been slightly changed in vols.IV-VI.

Copies: B.N.: Ye 7332-7; Maz.: 21993 A-F; Bod.Ox.: Douce.MM.182-7.

Notes: There is an engraved portrait of Marot as frontispiece.

21.01 REFUTATION/ DES/ ERREURS/ DE/ BENOIT DE SPINOSA/ Par M. DE
 FENELON Archevêque de/ Cambray, par le P. LAMI Benedictin & / par
 M. le Comte de BOULLAINVIL-/ LIERS./ AVEC/ LA VIE DE SPINOSA,/ Ecrite
par M. JEAN COLERUS, Ministre de / l'Eglise Lutherienne de la Haye;
augmentée de/ beaucoup de particularités tirées d'une Vie Ma-/
nusrite de ce Philosophe, faite par un de ses Amis./ [Typ.orn.] /
 A BRUXELLES,/ Chez FRANCOIS FOPPENS,/ [rule 35mm.] / MDCCXXXI, /

12°(142x80mm.): π^2 a-f¹² g¹⁰ A-V¹² X³. Pp.[8], 1-158, 1-483 (mis-
 printing 482, 483 as '182,183'), [2].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-7. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: Half-title; t.-p.; sign.al-a3, Avertissement; sign.a3,
 Table; pp.1-150, Vie de Spinoza; pp.151-8, Preface de M. le Comte
 de Boullainvilliers; pp.1-320, Refutation de Spinoza; pp.321-75,
 Extrait du Nouvel atheisme renversé ... Par Dom François Lami;
 pp.376-86, Extrait d'une Lettre de Monseigneur de Fénelon ... sur
 la Réfutation de Spinoza; pp.387-483, Certamen philosophicum...
 haec meditabatur Ishak Orobio; sign. X2-X3, Table.

Copies: B.N.: D²5220; B.L.: 223.a.23; T.C.D.: QQ.oo.52.

Notes: There was a stop-press correction made on p.313: some
 copies are missing the first 3 lines.
 The first review of this work which I have found was published in
 August 1731 in the Bibliothèque raisonnée des ouvrages des savants,
 vii, 163-86, and affirms that the book had, in fact, been printed in
 Amsterdam.

22.01 IMITATION/ DE/ JESUS-CHRIST,/ Traduite & revûë/ Par M. L. DU

 FRESNOI, D. de S./ Sur l'ancien Original François, d'où l'on a

tiré un/ Chapitre, qui manque dans les autres Editions./ AVEC
 L' ORDINAIRE DE LA/ SAINTE MESSE./ [Device: medallion surrounded

 by foliage, 35x40mm.] / A Anvers, & se vend/ A PARIS,/ Chez PIERRE

 GANDOUIN, Libraire,/ Quay des Augustins./ M. DCC. XXXI./

18° (134x75mm.): *¹² **⁶ ***¹² ****⁶ *****⁶ A-V¹²⁻⁶ X⁶ ***4 signed*(3).
 Pp.i-lxxxii, [2blank], 1-371.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-7 and 1-4. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: P.i, t.-p.; pp.iii-xiii, Avertissement; p.xiv, Priere;
 pp.xv-lxvii, Ordinaire, de la Sainte Messe; p.lxviii, Priere;
 pp.lxix-xxxii, Table; sign.*****6, blank; pp.1-371, De l'Imitation.

Copies: Maz.: 25060A; Ste.Gen.: Δ 55275; B.L.: IX.Fren.93.

Notes: There is an engraved frontispiece, signed 'A Paris Chez
 Pierre Gandouin Libraire.'

The typographical features of the edition suggest that it was in-
 deed printed in Antwerp, and sold by Gandouin with a permission
 from the administration.

Lenglet had already published an Imitation...en forme de prières
 (3.01), and in the later years of his life he was preparing a
 Latin edition of the same work (cf. Chapter VI, p.336).

22.02 'La même in 12. & in 8°. Anvers 1735.' (listed in L'Histoire justifiée,
 'Bernard' ed.); cf. Biog.univers., xxiv, 120: '1735, in-8°; cette
 édition est la meilleure'. Michault claims that the work was re-
 printed both in Paris and Antwerp in 1735, but he may be confusing
 the Paris edition with that of Cailleau published in 1737; he adds

that 'La dernière édition d'Anvers est d'une grande beauté et fort préférable à celle de Paris, qui est pleine de fautes et très-mal imprimée' (Mémoires, p.158). I have not located any copies of this edition.

22.03 IMITATION/ DE N.S./ JESUS-CHRIST,/ Traduite & revûë/ Sur l'ancien original François, d'où l'on a tiré un/ Chapitre, qui manque dans les autres Editions./ Par M. L'ABBE' LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ NOUVELLE E'DITION./[Device: cul-de-lampe, 40x50mm.]/ A PARIS,/ Chez ANDRE' CAILLEAU, Quai des/ Augustins, au coin de la rue Gist-le-Coeur,/ à Saint André./ [rule 55mm.]/ M. DCC. XXXVII./ Avec Approbation & Privilege du Roi./

12°(162x95mm.): *⁸ *² a-b¹² A-Q¹². Pp.i-xvi,[4], 1-48, 1-371, [13].

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: As for 22.01, with some corrections and additions to the Preface.

Copies: B.N.: D.16881; Ste.Gen.: Δ 55289.

Notes: There is a frontispiece and three other full-page engravings.

22.04 IMITATION/ DE NOTRE-SEIGNEUR/ JESUS-CHRIST,/ TRADUITE & revue sur l'ancien Original François, d'où l'on a tiré un chapitre,/ qui manque dans les autres Editions;/ Par M. l'Abbé LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ NOUVELLE ÉDITION;/ Augmentée de Prières à la fin de

chaque Chapitre,/tirées des Confessions & des Méditations/ de
Saint Augustin./ Avec Figures en Taille-Douce./[Device: fleuron,
 28x34mm.]/ A PARIS,/ Chez DUCHESNE, rue Saint Jacques,/ au-dessous
 de la Fontaine Saint Benoit,/ au Temple du Goût./[double rule 58mm.]/
 M. DCC. LXIV./ Ave» Approbation & Privilège du Roi./

12°(175x95mm.): π^1 A-Z¹² 2A². Pp.[2], 1-556.

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: As for 22.03, with a new section of prayers and psalms;
 the 'Ordinaire de la Sainte Messe' has been omitted.

Copies: Ste.Gen.: Δ 55347 and Δ 55351.

Notes: There are two full-page engravings and a frontispiece.
 There is a stop-press addition on p.4.

- 23.01 LES ARRETS/ D'AMOURS,/ AVEC/ L'AMANT RENDU CORDELIER,/ à l'Obſervance

 d'Amours./ PAR MARTIAL D'AUVERGNE, DIT,/ DE PARIS, Procureur au

 Parlement./ Accompagnez des Commentaires Juridiques, &/ Joyeux de
BENOIT DE COURT, Jurisconſulte. / DERNIERE EDITION,/ Revûë, corrigée

& augmentée de pluſieurs Arrêts, de/ notes, & d'un GLOSSAIRE des
anciens Termes./[Device: cherubs with a blind-folded judge, 32x38mm.]/
 A AMSTERDAM,/ Chez FRANCOIS CHANGUION, Libraire./ MDCCXXXI./

Variant imprint:
 [...] / A Amſterdam, & ſe vend/ A PARIS, / Chez PIERRE GANDOUIN,

 Libraire./ MDCCXXXI./

12° (161x93mm.): *¹² **¹² (±**1, ** 6,7) A-2C¹² 2D¹¹ [X8 signed 'X7'; 2C1 signed 'C'; 2C4 signed 'Cc']. Pp.i-xlvi, 1-645 [misprinting xxxiii as xxiii].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-7. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: P.1, t.-p.; pp.iii-xxviii, Avertissement; pp.xxix-xxxvii, Extrait des Memoires pour servir à l'Histoire des Hommes Illustres; pp.xxxviii-xlii, D. Mauritio Bulliodo; pp.xliii-vii, Authorum nomina; p.xlviii, Liste des Pieces; pp.1-500, Les Arrests d'amours; pp.501-98, L'Amant rendu cordelier; pp.599-600, Jugement definitif; pp.601-7, Edit de l'amour; pp.608-24, Rerum ac vocabulorum hujus operis index; pp.625-45, Glossaire des anciens termes.

Copies: B.N.: 8°y² 54147; B.L.:248.1.28; Bod.Ox.: Douce A 648.

Notes: Some copies were divided into two volumes, generally after p.290, and a title-page was printed for the 'SECONDE PARTIE'. The two cartons were printed on the orders of the censorship authorities in France, and were inserted into what was probably a small proportion of the copies sold in Paris (cf. Chapter IV, p.194).

Distribution seems to have got under way in Paris only in 1733 cf. p.191.

24.01 LE/ MOYEN/ DE/ PARVENIR:/ CONTENANT/ LA RAISON DE TOUT CE QUI/

 A ÉTÉ - EST ET SERA./ DERNIERE EDITION, [swash T]/ Exactement

 corrigée, & augmentée/ d'une Table des Matieres./ TOME PREMIER./

 [Device: cul-de-lampe with birds and foliage, 23x50mm.] / NULLE

 PART. [swash T]/ 100070032./

T. II.

[In black only]

LE/ [...] / A ÉTÉ, EST ET SERA./ [...] / TOME SECOND./ [...]

12° (137x85mm.): T.I.)(⁶A¹² B-T⁶. Pp. [12], 1-239.

T.II. Sign. π^1 A-U⁶ X⁴ Y⁶. Pp. [2], 1-260 [Misprinting 253 as '553'].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-4. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: T.I. Sign.)(1, t.-p.; sign.)(2-)(6, Dissertation; sign.)(6, Gerontes et Ancilla; pp.1-239, Le Moyen de Parvenir.

T.II. T.-p.; pp.1-248, Le Moyen de Parvenir; pp.249-60, Table des matieres.

Copies: B.N.: Rés. Y² 2795-6 (bound in one vol.).

Notes: The typographical features suggest that this work was printed in Holland, like so many of the other editions of this period.

24.02 LE/ MOYEN/ DE/ PARVENIR:/ CONTENANT./ LA RAISON DE TOUT CE QUI/ A

 ÉTÉ, EST ET SERA./ DERNIERE EDITION,/ Exactement corrigée, &

 augmentée/ d'une Table des Matieres./ TOME PREMIER./ [Device:

 fleuron, 25x42mm.] / NULLE PART./ 100070034./

T.II.

[In black only:]

LE/ [..] / 100070032./

12° (137x85mm.):)(⁶A-K¹² L⁵. Pp. [12], 1-250.

T.II. π^1 A-K¹² L⁴ M⁶. Pp. [2], 1-260.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-7. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: Exactly as for 24.01.

Copies: B.L.: 1080.b.10.

24.03 LE/ MOYEN/ DE/ PARVENIR:/ CONTENANT/ LA RAISON DE TOUT CE/ QUI A
ÉTÉ, EST ET SERA./ DERNIERE EDITION. [swash T]/ Exactement corrigée,
& augmentée/ d'une Table des Matieres./ TOME PREMIER./ [Typ.orn.]/
NULLE PART./ 100070038./

T.II.

LE/ [..] EDITION,/[.]/ TOME SECOND./ [..]

18° (129x80mm.): T.I. $\tilde{a}^8 A-V^{12-6} X^2$. Pp.[16], 1-363.

T.II. $\pi^2 A-V^{12-6} X^3$. Pp.[4], 1-366.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-6, 1-3. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: As for 24.01.

Copies: B.N.: Rés. Y² 2797-8 and Rés. Y² 2799-800; B.L.: 1080.b.11.

24.04 LE MOYEN/ DE/ PARVENIR/ CONTENANT/ LA RAISON DE TOUT/ ce qui a
été, est & sera./ DERNIERE EDITION, [swash T]/ Exactement corrigée
& augmentée d'une/ Table des Matieres. [swash T]/ TOME PREMIER. [TOME
SECOND.]/ [Typ.orn.]/ NULLE PART./ [double rule, 49mm.]/ 100070039./

Production and Contents: exactly as for 24.03.

Copies: B.N.: Rés. Y² 2801-2 and Rés. Y² 2803-4.

24.05 Le Moyen..., 1747: edition recorded by Jean Gay, Bibliographie des ouvrages relatifs à l'amour, iii, 286.

24.06 Le Moyen..., 1754: recorded by Gay, Bibliographie..., iii, 286.

An augmented edition with notes, published in 1757, and subsequent re-editions have often been attributed to Lenglet, but since the abbé died in Jan. 1755 this attribution appears to be without foundation.

25.01 SATYRES/ ET/ AUTRES OEUVRES/ DE/REGNIER, / ACCOMPAGNE'ES/ DE

 REMARQUES HISTORIQUES./ Nouvelle Edition considerablement

augmentée./ [Device: poet writing in a book, assisted by two cherubs;
 signed 'C.N. Cochin S.'; 66x108mm.]/ A LONDRES,/ Chez JACOB

 TONSON, Libraire/ Du Roy & du Parlement./ M.DCC.XXXIII./

4° (285x225mm.): Sign. *-**⁴ ***² A-3F⁴ 3G². Pp.i-xx, 1-420.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-3. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: P.i, t.-p.; pp.iii-iv, Au Roy [signed Regnier]; pp.v-x, Avertissement; pp.xi-xiv, Jugemens sur Regnier; pp.xv-xx, Ode a Regnier; pp.1-2, Au Roy [as for pp.iii-iv]; pp.3-231, Satyres; pp.233-59, Epistres; pp.261-88, Elegies; pp.289-335, [Poesies meslées]; pp.337-45, Epigrammes; pp.346-57, [Poesies spirituelles]; pp.358-62, Stances...Les Proverbes d'amour; pp.363-7, Ode. Sur un combat entre Regnier et Berthelot Poëtes Satiriques; pp.369-416, Poesies choisies des Sieurs Motin, Berthelot, Et autres Poëtes celebres du temps de Regnier; pp.417-20, Table Des Pieces.

Copies: B.N.: Ye 1079; B.L.:640.ff.1; Bod.Ox.: Douce.R.208.

Notes: There is an engraved frontispiece. The text is printed within a border of red typ.orns. A number of large-paper copies were issued.

This edition was printed by Oléander in Amsterdam by arrangement with Lenglet; the printing was started in 1732, but was halted at the signature 'M', by order of the Dutch authorities, late in that year. It was not completed until early in 1734, at which time some of the completed copies may have been seized and destroyed by the authorities (see Chapter IV, pp.208-13).

26.01 DE/ L'USAGE/ DES/ ROMANS,/ Où l'on fait voir leur utilité &/ leurs

 differens caractères:/ AVEC UNE BIBLIOTHEQUE/ des Romans,/

 Accompagnée de Remarques critiques/ sur leur choix & leurs Editions./
 Par M. le C. GORDON DE PERCEL./ TOME I./ [Typ.orn.] / A AMSTERDAM,/
 Chez la Veuve DE POILRAS,/ à la Vérité sans fard./ [rule 60mm.] /

 MDCCXXXIV./

 T.II.

BIBLIOTHEQUE/ DES/ ROMANS,/ AVEC DES REMARQUES/ critiques sur leur

 choix &/ leurs différentes Editions./ Par M. le C. GORDON DE PERCEL./
 TOME II./ [Device: an arm holding a globe; 34x33mm.] / A AMSTERDAM,/
 Chez la Veuve DE POILRAS,/ à la Vérité sans fard./ [rule 59mm.] /

 MDCCXXXIV./

 T.II.

12°(168x90mm.): T.I. $\pi^2 \bar{a}^8 A^{12} B^{12} (\pm B^{12}) C-G^{12} (\pm G^7) H-R^{12} S-T^6$.

Pp. [18], 1-334, [14], 1-60, [24].

T.II. $\pi^2 \star^6 A-T^{12}$. Pp. [14], 1-360, [96].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-6. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: H.-t.; t.-p.; sign.ã1-ã7, Preface; sign.ã8, Table des Chap-
 itres; pp.1-334, De l'Usage; sign.012, h.-t.: Pieces curieuses sur

le poète Rousseau; sign.Pl-P6, Avertissement; pp.1-42, Epitre Dedicatoire; pp.43-60, Lettre à S.E.M. Le Marquis de Fenelon; sign.S1-T6, Table des matieres; sign.T6, Errata.

T.II. H.-t.; t.-p.; sign.*1-*4, Avertissement; sign.*5-*6, Table des articles; pp.1-342, Bibliotheque des romans; pp.343-60, Addition à la Bibliothèque des Romans; sign.Q1-T12, Table alphabetique.

Copies: B.N.: Y²6011-2; B.L.: 680.a.12; Bod.Ox.: Douce.L.619-20.

Notes: This work was, in fact, printed in Rouen, by Viret (see Chapter IV, pp.222-3); T.I was published in February, but T.II was not issued until early in April (cf. p.224).

The 'Addition à la Bibliothèque des romans' was undoubtedly written as the Bibliothèque was being printed, for it lists novels dated 1734, and which appeared between January and March of that year. Lenglet did not, however, adjust his 'Table alphabétique' to include the additional material.

Lenglet had clearly planned a second edition, at least of the Bibliothèque des romans: there is a copy of T.II in the B.N., bound in three volumes (Rēs.Y².1214-6), where Lenglet has written his corrections and additions regarding novels published up to 1739 on blank leaves, interspersed between the printed pages, and has incorporated the 'Additions' of 1734 into their appropriate places in the main catalogue.

27.01 L'HISTOIRE/ JUSTIFIEE/ CONTRE LES ROMANS./ Par M. l'Abbé LENGLET

..... DU FRESNOY./ [8 lines of typ.orns. in triangular arrangement]/

..... A AMSTERDAM,/ Chez J. F. BERNARD, au Poëte/ Piron./ [rule 58mm.]/

..... M. DCCXXXV./

Variant title-page:

As for above, with no full-stop after 'ROMANS/', and rule 50mm.

12° (159x90mm.): $\pi^1 \hat{a}^6 A-Q^{12} R^4 S^8 T^{12} V^5$ [D4 signed 'Diii'; T3-5 signed 'Siii, Siv, Sv']. Pp. [14], 1-391, i-1.

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: T.p.; h.-t.; sign.ã2-ã3, Avertissement; sign.ã3-ã5, Liste des Ouvrages de l'auteur; sign. ã6, Table des articles; pp.1-367, L'Histoire justifiée; pp.i-1, Pièces curieuses citées dans cet Ouvrage.

Copies: B.N.:Y²6014; B.L.: 244.i.20; Bod.Ox.: Douce L.64.

Notes: There appear to have been two different versions of the t.-p., though the differences are so insignificant that they may be simply stop-press corrections.

The typographical features, together with the list of Lenglet's avowed and 'respectable' works, which was clearly intended to impress the French authorities, strongly suggest that the work was printed in Paris. This is corroborated by the Bibliothèque française, xxii (1736), 180, though Michault gives Rouen as the place of origin, possibly through confusion with De l'Usage des romans (Mémoires, p.110). The reviews of the work indicate that it was published early in 1735; it was clearly rushed through the presses, and is full of printing errors.

27.02 L'HISTOIRE/ JUSTIFIÉE/ CONTRE LES/ ROMANS./ PAR Mr. L'ABBE' /

.....
LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ [Device: weighing scales with scroll bearing
.....
words 'VIS UNITA MAJOR'; 41x59mm.] / A AMSTERDAM,/ Aux dépens de
.....
la COMPAGNIE./ M. DCCXXXV./

12° (162x93mm.): ✕⁴ A-O¹² P⁶ Q⁷. Pp. [8], 1-362.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-7. Catchwords every page.

Contents: As for no.27.01, minus the final paragraph of the 'Avertissement', and the 'Liste des ouvrages de l'auteur'.

Copies: B.N.: Y²6013; Maz.: 51738; B.L.: 580.a.28.

Notes: The typographical features of this edition suggest that it was indeed published in Holland; it was probably issued without the collaboration of the author, and possibly as late as 1736, in the course of which year it was first mentioned by the Bibliothèque française (xxii, 180)

28.01 LE/ ROMAN/ DE/ LA ROSE,/ Par GUILLAUME DE LORRIS/ & JEAN DE MEUN
dit CLOPINEL./ Revu sur plusieurs Editions & sur/ quelques anciens
Manuscrits./ ACCOMPAGNE'/ De plusieurs autres Ouvrages, d'une Preface/
historique, de Notes & d'un Glossaire./ TOME I. [TOME II./ TOME III.]/
[Typ.orn.]/ A PARIS,/ Chez la veuve PISSOT, Quay de Conty,/ à la
descente du Pont-neuf, à la Croix d'or./ [rule 69mm.]/ MDCCXXXV./
Avec Aprobation & Privilege du Roy./

12° (166x95mm.): $\pi^2 \bar{a}^{12} \bar{e}^{12} \bar{i}^{10} A^{12} B^2 C-P^{12} Q^{11}$. Pp. [4], i-lxvi,
[2], 1-362.

T.II. $\pi^1 A-R^{12} S^8$. Pp. [2], 1-424.

T.III. $\pi^1 A-Q^{12}$. Pp. [2], 1-384.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-6. Preliminaries (T.I) have catchwords
on every page; elsewhere quire catchwords.

Contents: T.I. H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-xlvi, Preface; pp.xlix-liv,
Preface de Clement Marot; pp.lv-lxvi, Vie de Jean Clopinel; sign. f10,
Privilege du Roy; pp.1-362, Le Roman de la Rose.

T.II. T.-p.; pp.1-398, Le Roman...; pp.399-424, Notes sur le Roman
de la Rose.

T.III. T.-p.; pp.1-106, Le Codicille de Maistre Jean de Meung;
pp.107-70, Le Testament de Maistre Jean de Meung; pp.171-204, Les
Remonstrances de Nature a l'Alchimiste Errant; pp.205-32, La Response

de l'Alchimiste a Nature; pp.233-4, Testament attribué a Arnauld de Villeneuve; pp.235-56, Petit Traicté d'Alchymie; pp.257-8, Autres vers touchant le mesme Art; pp.259-94, La Fontaine des Amoureux de Science; pp.295-6, Balade du Secret des Philosophes; pp.297-384, Glossaire.

Copies: B.N.: Ye.7261-3; Ars.: 8°B.L.8676; B.L.:1065.f.16-18.

Notes: Since this version of the work was presented to the royal censor for approval, Lenglet was obliged to tone down the Preface which he had written for the edition, first announced as being published in Amsterdam (Bibliothèque des romans, p.234). But there was a separate, unauthorised issue containing the Preface in its original state (see no.28.02).

28.02 LE/ ROMAN/ [... Typ.orn. as for 28.01]/ A AMSTERDAM,/ Chez JEAN FRED. BERNARD./ [rule 68mm.]/ MDCCXXXV./

12°(162x95mm.): T.I. $\pi^2 \bar{a}^{12} \bar{e}^{12} \bar{i}^8 \bar{o}^2 A^2 B-P^{12} Q^{11}$. Pp.[4], i-lxviii, 1-362.

T.II and T.III. Identical to 28.01.

Contents: This is a separate issue of no.28.01, with different t.-p.s, and the following elements in T.I:

H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-xxxviii, Preface; pp.xxxix-xlvi, Preface de Clement Marot; pp.xlix-lxviii, Vie de Jean Clopinel; sign.A1-B12 (pp.1-28), Le Roman... [variant state of the text from that of no. 28.01].

From sign.C1 (p.29) of T.I the text is printed from the same type-setting as no. 28.01.

Copies: B.N.: Ye.32353, 53bis, 54; Rés.Ye.4118-20 (bound with the arms of Marie Antoinette); B.L.: 684.b.22-4.

Notes: This issue was undoubtedly also printed in Paris; the name of the supposed publisher is the same as that which Lenglet used for the French edition of L'Histoire justifiée (27.01). He apparently changed the first 28 pages of the text of the poem in order to substantiate the claim that this unauthorised version was unrelated to his edition (28.01), and was of foreign origin.

29.01 DE L'USAGE/ ET DU CHOIX/ DES LIVRES/ POUR L'ÉTUDE/ DES BELLES
LETTRES./ AVEC/ Des Catalogues raisonnés des Auteurs/ utiles ou
nécessaires, pour se former dans les diverses parties de la Lit-/
térature./ Par M. l'Abbé LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ [Typ.orn.] / A PARIS,
QUAY DES AUGUSTINS,/ Chez [bracket enclosing 4 lines] MUSIER Pere,/
ROLLIN Fils,/ DE BURE l'aîné,/ DE BURE le jeune./ [rule 57mm.] /
M. DCC. XXXVI./

12° (153x88mm.): A¹². Pp. [2], 1-22.

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. No catchwords.

Contents: Sign.Al, t.-p.; pp.1-7, Lettre a Monsieur *** ; pp.9-18,
De l'usage et du choix des livres; pp.19-22, Catalogues pour les
Belles Lettres.

Copies: B.N.: Zz.4024; Maz.: 47224.

Notes: Lenglet first mentioned this project in the 'Liste des ouvrages de l'auteur' in his Histoire justifiée (27.01), where it is announced as being published in Amsterdam. The work was never in fact printed, probably because of a weak public response to this Prospectus.

30.01 GEOGRAPHIE/ DES ENFANS,/ OU/ METHODE ABREGÉE/ DE/ LA GEOGRAPHIE./
Divisée par Leçons; avec la Liste des/ Cartes nécessaires aux Enfants./
Par M. l'Abbé LENGLET.DUFRESNOY. [swash A]/ [Device: cul-de-lampe,

25x37mm.] / A PARIS, / Quay des Augustins, du côté du Pont/ Saint Michel./ Chez [bracket enclosing 2 lines] ROLLIN fils, à S. Athanaïse./ DE BURE l'aîné, à S. Paul./ [rule 61mm.]/ M. DCC. XXXVI./ Avec Approbation & Privilege du Roy. [swash A twice]/

12°(167x97mm.): a⁶ A-M⁸⁻⁴ N⁶. Pp.i-xii, 1-153, [3].

Production: Signs. roman 1-4, 1-2. Quire catchwords.

Contents: P.i, t.-p.; pp.iii-viii, Avertissement; pp.ix-xii, Table; pp.1-153, Géographie...[Leçons I-XLVIII]; sign.N5-N6, Approbation & Privilege.

Copies: B.N.:G.10543.

Notes: Pp.1-153 are printed from the same type-setting as the corresponding section in the Méthode pour étudier la géographie, 1736ed. (no.13.03) which was issued shortly after this edition.

30.02 GEOGRAPHIE/ DES ENFANS, / OU/ METHODE ABREGÉE/ DE/ LA GEOGRAPHIE./

Divisée par Leçons; avec la Liste des/ Cartes nécessaires aux Enfans./ NOUVELLE ÉDITION./ Par M. l'Abbé LENGLET DU FRESNOY./

[Device: fleuron, 20x23mm.] / A PARIS, / Quay des Augustins, du côté du Pont/ Saint Michel./ Chez [bracket enclosing 2 lines] ROLLIN fils, à S. Athanaïse./ DE BURE l'aîné, à S. Paul./ [rule 61mm.]/ M. DCC. XXXVI./ Avec Approbation & Privilege du Roy./

12°(167x100mm.): *⁶ A-M⁸⁻⁴ N⁶. Pp.i-xii, 1-156.

Production, Contents: As for 30.01.

Copies: B.N.: G.32132; Ars.: 8°H.162.

Notes: This edition appeared after the Méthode pour étudier la géographie, 1736ed. (no.13.03) which is mentioned in a note on p.xii. It contains a 'Mappe-monde' bound in after the preliminaries.

- 30.03 'Geographie des enfans; ou, Méthode abregée de la géographie, divisée par leçons avec la liste des cartes nécessaires aux enfans. Amsterdam, Aux dépens de la Compagnie, 1736. 4p. L., 156, [4]p. front. (fold.map)' Nat. Union Cat. Cf. no. 30.11 below.
- 30.04 THE/ GEOGRAPHY/ OF/ CHILDREN:/ OR/ A SHORT and EASY METHOD of/ Teaching or Learning GEOGRAPHY./ WHEREBY/ Even CHILDREN may in a short Time/ know the Use of MAPS, and all the con-/ siderable Countries in the WORLD, their/ Boundaries, Extent, Division, Islands, Ri-/ vers, Lakes, chief Cities, Government, and Religion./ Divided into LESSONS, by way of/ QUESTION and ANSWER./ With a Small neat MAP of the WORLD pre-/ fix'd, and also a List of the MAPS necessary/ for CHILDREN./ [rule 70mm.]/ Translated from the French of Abbot LENGLET [swash T]/ DUFRESNOY, just published in Paris; with/ the Addition of a more particular Account of/ GREAT BRITAIN and IRELAND./ [rule 70mm.]/ LONDON,/ Printed for EDWARD LITTLETON, at the Mitre in/ Fleetstreet; and JOHN HAWKINS, at the Falcon in St. Paul's Church-yard. MDCCXXXVII./
- 12°(161x95mm.): A-L⁶ M⁵. Pp.i-vii, [5], 1-129.
- Production: Signs. arabic 1-3. Catchwords on every page.
- Contents: P.i, t.-p.; pp.iii-vii, Preface; sign.A4-A6, The Contents; pp.1-129, The Geography of Children [Lessons I-XLVIII].

Copies: B.L.: 1607/254.

Notes: The Preface is a slightly abridged version of Lenglet's Preface. There is 'A New Map of the World' bound in after the preliminaries. Cf. no.30.06.

- 30.05 'Kurz verfa te Kindergeographie in 45 Lektionen etc. Mit den benötigten Charten ins Hochdeutsche übersetzt von M.J.F.S. Nürnberg; Monath.1737'. Bayerischer Zentralkatalog; Zentralkatalog Baden-Württemberg. Cf. below no.30.10.
- 30.06 'The geography of children: or, A short and easy method of teaching or learning geography. Designed principally for the use of schools. Divided into lessons, by way of question and answer ...Translated from the French, with the addition of a more particular account of Great Britain and Ireland. 2d ed., corr. London, Printed for E. Littleton, 1738. xii, 152p. fold.map. 17cm.' Nat. Union Cat. Cf. no. 30.13 below.
- 30.07 GEOGRAFIA/ DE' FANCIULLI;/ OVVERO/ BREVE METODO/ DI GEOGRAFIA/ ACCOMODATO ALLA CAPACITA DE' GIOVANETTI/ Diviso in varie Lezioni, con la lista delle/ Carte necessarie per istudiarla,/ DEL SIGN. AB./ LENGLET DUFRESNOY./ NUOVAMENTE STAMPATA IN FRANCESE/ CON LA SPIEGAZIONE ITALIANA,/ Dedicato a Loro Eccell. li Signori/ VETTOR, E PIETRO/ FRATELLI PISANI./ IN VENEZIA,/ PER GIAMBATISTA ALBR IZZI q. GIROL./ M DCCXXXVIII./

8°(158x100mm.): ✕ ¹² A-V⁸ . Pp. [22], 1-311, [8].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-4. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: As for no.30.01, with augmented section on Italy, and

the Italian translation opposite the French text.

Copies: B.N.: G.10554.

Notes; There is a fold-out map bound at the back of the volume.
Cf. no.30.14 below.

30.08 GEOGRAPHIE/ DES ENFANS,/ OU [swash U] / METHODE ABREGÉE/ DE/ LA
GEOGRAPHIE./ Divisée par Leçons; avec la Liste des prin-/ cipales
Cartes nécessaires aux Jeunes gens./ QUATRIÈME EDITION./ Augmentée
du Plan de l'ancienne Geographie & des/ Systèmes du Monde, avec
plusieurs Cartes & Figures. / Par M. l'Abbé LENGLET DU FRESNOY./
[Device: cul-de-lampe; 23x34mm.]/ A PARIS;/ Chez [within a bracket]
ROLLIN fils, à S. Athanase./ DE BURE l'aîné, à S. Paul. [close
bracket]/ Quay des/ Augustins/ [rule 66mm.]/ M. DCC. XL./ Avec
Approbation & Privilege du Roy./

12°(164x95mm.): a¹² A-H¹². Pp.i-xxiv, 1-192.

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: P.i, h.-t.; p.iii, t.-p.; pp.v-xviii, Avertissement;
pp.xix-xxiii, Table; p.xxiv, Avis; pp.1-122, Geographie... [Leçons
I-XLVIII]; pp.123-74, Principes generaux de l'ancienne geographie;
pp.175-89, Abregé de l'astronomie; pp.189-92, Approbation...
Privilege.

Copies: Ars.: 8°H.163.

Notes: There are four fold-out maps in this edition.

30.09 GEOGRAPHIE/ DES ENFANS,/ OU/ METHODE ABREGE'E/ DE/ LA GEOGRAPHIE./

Divisée par Leçons; avec la Liste des prin- / cipales Cartes
nécessaires aux jeunes gens./ QUATRIE'ME EDITION./ Augmentée du
Plan de l'ancienne Geographie & des/ Systèmes du Monde, avec
plusieurs Cartes & figures./ Par M. l'Abbé LENGLET DU FRESNOY./
[Device: as in 30.08]/ A PARIS,/ Chez [within a bracket] ROLLIN
fils, à S. Athanase./ DE BURE l'aîné, à S. Paul. [close bracket]/
Quay/ des/ Augustins/[rule 65mm.]/ M DCC. XL./ Avec Approbation &
Privilege du Roy./

12°(166x95mm.): \tilde{a}^{12} A-H¹². Pp.i-xxiv, 1-191.

Production, Contents: as for 30.08.

Copies: B.N.: G.10542; Ars.: 8°H.164.

Notes: Some minor changes in the preliminaries show that this was a later edition than 30.08; the publishers apparently did not wish to advertise a 5th edition, as this would have angered clients who had just bought edition no.30.08.

30.10 'Kurzgefasste Kindergeographie...Nürnberg, Monath, 1741, 8°'.

Zentralkatalog Baden-Württemberg; Bayerischer Zentralkatalog. See no. 30.15 below.

30.11 'Géographie des enfans ou méthode abrégée de la géographie.

Amsterdam, 1744.' Cat. Coll., Berne; Niedersächsische Zentralkatalog. Cf. no. 30.20.

30.12 'Géographie, ou méthode abrégée de Géographie. (Laus.). 1744.8'

Cat. Coll., Berne. Cf. no. 30.18 below.

30.13 THE/ GEOGRAPHY/ OF/ CHILDREN,/ OR/A SHORT and EASY METHOD of/
 Teaching or Learning GEOGRAPHY:/ Designed principally for the Use
 of SCHOOLS./ Whereby/ Even CHILDREN may in a short Time know/ the
 Use of the TERRESTRIAL GLOBE, and Geographical MAPS, and all the
 considerable/ Countries in the WORLD; their Situation, Boundaries,
 Extent, Division, Islands, Rivers,/ Lakes, chief Cities, Government
 and Religion./ Divided into LESSONS, by way of/ QUESTION, and
ANSWER,/ With a New general MAP of the WORLD, and also/ a List
 of the Maps necessary for Children./ [rule 75mm.]/ Translated
from the French, of Abbot Lenglet du Fresnoy,/ and now greatly
Augmented and Improv'd thro' the Whole./ [rule 70mm.]/ THE THIRD
 EDITION./ [rule 69mm.]/ To which is prefix'd, a Method of Learning
 Geogra-/ phy without a Master, for the Use of such grown Persons/
 as have neglected this useful Study in their Youth./ And to this
 Edition is now added, A Table of the LA-/ TITUDE and LONGITUDE,/
 of the most remarkable Places/ mentioned in this Work./ [rule 72mm.]/
LONDON:/ Printed for C. CORBETT, at Addison's Head, over-against/
 St Dunstan's Church Fleet-street; and T. HARRIS,/ at the Looking-
glass and Bible on London-bridge, 1744./ [Price bound in Sheep,
 1s.6d. in Calf, 2s.]/

12° (156x96mm.): A-M⁶ N⁴ O⁶ [G2 signed 'G3'; I2 signed 'I3'].
 Pp.i-x, [2], 1-140, 145-154, [2].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-3. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: P.1, t.-p.; p.ii, Just Publish'd...; pp.iii-viii, The
 Preface; pp.ix-x, How to learn Geography without a Master; sign. A6,
 Contents; pp.1-140, The Geography... Lessons I-LXV ; pp.145-54,

A Table of the Situation, Latitude, and Longitude of the most remarkable places; sign. 06, Books lately Publish'd.

Copies: B.N.: G.10547.

Notes: One fold-out map bound before p.1. The lessons on France have been curtailed, and those on Great Britain given more emphasis; the order of some of the other lessons has been changed.Cf.no. 30.35.

30.14 GEOGRAFIA / DE' FANCIULLI;/ OVVERO BREVE METODO/ DI GEOGRAFIA/
ACCOMODATO ALLA CAPACITA DE' GIOVANETTI, E/ Diviso in varie Lezioni,
con la lista delle/ Carte necessarie per istudiarla,/ DEL SIGN. AB.
LENGLET DUFRESNOY./ EDIZIONE SECONDA FRANCESE/ ED ITALIANA./ A Sua
Eccellenza il Signor/ ALVISE I°. MOCENIGO./ IN VENEZIA,/ PER
GIAMBATISTA ALBRIZZI q. GIROL./ M DCC XLVI./

Pp. [22], 1-311, [8].

Copies:*Frib.: FB 180. Cf. no. 30.17.

30.15 'Kurz verfasste Kinder-Geographie... Nürnberg: Monath 1746. 55S.4°'.
Zentralkatalog Baden-Württemberg. Cf. no. 30.21.

30.16 GEOGRAPHIE/ ABREGÉE/ PAR DEMANDES/ ET/ RÉPONSES,/ DIVISEE PAR
LEÇONS;/ Avec la Liste de quelques Cartes nécessaires/ aux
Commencans./ SIXIÈME ÉDITION,/ Augmentée du Plan de l'ancienne
Géographie & des/ Systèmes du Monde, avec plusieurs Cartes./ Par
M. l'Abbé LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ [Typ.orn.]/ A PARIS,/ Chez DE BURE
l'aîné, Quai des Augustins,/ à S. Paul./[rule 57mm.]/ M. DCC. LII./
Avec Approbation & Privilege du Roi./

Variant t.-p.:

GEOGRAPHIE/ ABREGÉE/ PAR DEMANDES/ ET RÉPONSES,/ DIVISÉE PAR
LEÇONS;/ Avec la Liste de quelques Cartes nécessaires/ aux
Commençans./ SIXIÈME ÉDITION./ Augmentée du Plan de l'ancienne
Géographie &/ des Systèmes du Monde, avec plusieurs Cartes./ Par
M. l'Abbé LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ [Typ.orn.]/ A PARIS,/ Chez N
TILLIARD, Libraire, Quai des/ Augustins, à S. Benoît./ [Double rule
52mm.]/ M. DCC. LII./ Avec Approbation & Privilège du Roi./

12°(164x94mm.): a¹² b² A-K¹² L⁶ [a5 signed 'Av']. Pp.i-xxviii, 1-247,
[5].

Production, Contents: As for no. 30.08 (with minor changes in the
'Avertissement' etc.).

Copies: B.N.: G.10544; Ge.FF.514; Ars.: 8°H.165.

30.17 'Geografia de' fanciulli; ovvero metodo breve di geografia,
accomodato alla capacità de' giovanetti. In Venezia, Luigi Pavini,
1752, 18x11.5'. Cat. Coll., Berne. See below no. 30.34.

30.18 GEOGRAPHIE/ DES ENFANS,/ OU/ METHODE ABREGÉE/ DE LA/ GEOGRAPHIE./
Divisée par Leçons, avec la Liste des/ Cartes nécessaires aux Enfants./
Par Mr. l'Abbé/ LENGLET DUFRESNOY./ [Device: cherubs looking at a
globe; 21x30mm.]/ A LAUSANNE,/ Chez MARC- MICHEL BOUSQUET/ &
Compagnie./ MDCCLIV./

12°(162x91mm.): π⁴ A-D¹² E⁸ F². Pp.[8], 1-114,[2].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-6. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: As for 30.01, with abridged 'Avertissement'.

Copies: B.N.: G.10548.

Notes: There is one fold-out map. See below no.30.22.

- 30.20 'Geographie des Enfants. Amsterdam ... 1754'. Bayerischer Zentral-katalog. Cf. below no.30.38.
- 30.21 'Kurzverfassetete Kinder-Geographie in 48 Lectionen...Nürn. 1758.f°'. Cat. Coll., Berne. Cf. below no. 30.24.
- 30.22 'Géographie des enfans ou méthode abrégée de la Géographie. Lausanne, aux dépens de d'Arnay, 1759, in-12. cart. moderne. 150 fr.' Catalogue d'histoire naturelle, Valette, 21 rue Tournon, Paris 6e. Cf. no.30.23.
- 30.23 'Géographie des enfans... Lausanne, Bourgnat, 1759, 8°'. Zentral-katalog Baden-Württemberg. This may be the same edition as 30.22 with a separate title-page. Cf. below no. 30.36.
- 30.24 'Kurzverfassetete Kinder Geographie in acht und vierzig Lectionen etc. Nürnberg 1760. Fol.' Cat. Coll., Berne. Cf. below no. 30.25.
- 30.25 'Kurzverfassetete kinder geographie, in acht und vierzig lectionen eingetheilet, und mit benöthigten charten versehen. In französ-ischer sprache ausgefertigt durch den herrn abt Lenglet du Fresnoy, und zum nutzen der jugend in die teutsche übersetzt, nunmehr aber von neuem übersehen, in vielen stücken deutlicher gemacht, mit nicht wenigen nützlichen zusätzen vermehret, und insonderheit zum gebrauch

für teutsche eingerichtet. 5e. und vieles verbesserte, und vermehrte auflage. Mit allergnädigster freiheit. 2p.l., 55pp., 8 maps. 4°. Nürnberg, G.P. Monath, 1764. [...] It has been slightly changed and augmented by the translator. 'Nat. Union Cat.'; Cat.Coll., Berne; Hessicher Zentralkatalog. Cf. no. 30.31.

30.26 'Géographie des enfans, ou méthode abrégée de la géographie. Divisée par leçons, avec la liste des cartes nécessaires aux enfans. Par M. l'Abbé LANGLET DUFRESNOI. Avignon 1765. Ant. Offray. 1 vol. in-12'. Cat. de la Bibliothèque communale d'Amiens (1856), Histoire I, 147. Cf. nos. 30.27 and 30.28 below.

30.27 'Géographie des enfans, ou Methode abrégée de la géographie. Divisée par leçons, avec la liste des cartes nécessaires aux enfans. Par m. l'abbé Lenglet Dufresnoy. A Avignon, Chez L. Chambeau, M.DCC.LXV. vii, 114, [2]p. fold. map. 16.5cm.' Nat. Union Cat. This 'edition', along with 30.26, may be simply separate issues of no.30.28.

30.28 GEOGRAPHIE/ DES ENFANS,/ OU/ METHODE ABRE'GE'E/ DE LA/ GEOGRAPHIE./
Divisée par Leçons, avec la Liste/ des Cartes nécessaires aux enfans./
Par M. l'Abbé/ LENGLET DUFRESNOY./ [Typ.orn.] / A AVIGNON,/ Chez LOUIS
CHAMBEAU,/ Imprimeur-/ Libraire, près les R.R.P.P. Jésuites./ [Double
rule, 62mm.]/ M. DCC. LXVI./ Avec permission des Superieurs./

12°(166x95mm.): A-K⁸⁻⁴ L². Pp.i-vii, 1-114, [2].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-4, 1-2. Quire catchwords.

Contents: As for 30.18.

Copies: Ars.: 8°H.167; *B.N.: G.10545.

30.29 GÉOGRAPHIE/ ABRÉGÉE,/ PAR DEMANDES/ ET PAR RÉPONSES,/ DIVISÉE PAR
 LEÇONS,/ Pour l'Instruction de la Jeunesse;/ Avec une idée de
l'ancienne Géographie,/ & des Systèmes du Monde./ Par M. l'Abbé
 LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ SEPTIEME ÉDITION,/ Revue, corrigée & augmentée./
 [Typ.orn.]/ A PARIS,/ Chez N. M. TILLIARD, Libraire, Quai/ des
 Augustins, à Saint Benoît./ [Double rule 58mm.]/ M. DCC. LXVI./ Avec
Approbation & Privilège du Roi./

12°(166x96mm.): a¹² A-K¹² L⁶. Pp.i-xxiv, 1-252.

Production, Contents: As for no.30.08, with a number of changes and
 additions, especially in the section on France (cf.'Avis du libraire').
 It was edited by Barbeau de la Bruyère, Lenglet having died in 1755.

Copies: B.N.: G.10549; Ste.Gen.: G.8°4⁸. Inv.1514.

30.30 GEOGRAPHIE/ DES ENFANS,/ OU/ METHODE ABREGÉE/ DE LA/ GÉOGRAPHIE;/
 Divisée par Leçons, avec la Liste des/ Cartes nécessaires aux
 Enfants./ Par Mr. L'Abbé/ LENGLET DUFRESNOY./ [Typ.-orn. in form of
 cul-de-lampe]/ A LAUSANNE/ Chez J.P. HEUBACH & Compagnie./ [Double
 rule 60mm.]/ M. DCC. LXIX./

12°(162x92mm.): †² A-D¹² E⁸ F². Pp.i-iv, 1-114, [2].

Production, Contents: As for 30.18. Cf. below no. 30.36.

Copies: B.N.: G.10546.

30.31 'Kurzverfassetete kinder geographie, in acht und vierzig lectionen
 eingetheilet ... [as for 30.25] ...eingerichtet. 6., um vieles verb.,

und verm., aufl. Nürnberg, G.P. Monath, 1769. 55p. col.double maps.' Nat. Union Cat.; Zentralkatalog Baden-Württemberg. Cf. below no. 30.39.

30.32 'Géographie Abrégée. Par demandes et réponses... 7 ed. revue, corrigée et augmentée. Vienne, Trattner, 1774. xxiv, 271S. 1 Taf.' . ÖEsterreichische Nationalbibliothek: 249.017.A.K.

30.33 [2 lines decorative print] GÉOGRAPHIE/ ABREGÉE,/ PAR DEMANDES ET PAR RÉPONSES;/ DIVISÉE PAR LEÇONS,/ Pour l'Instruction de la Jeunesse./ Avec un Précis de l'ancienne Géographie,/ & des Systèmes du Monde./ Par M. l'Abbé LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ HUITIEME ÉDITION,/ Revue, corrigée & augmentée d'un Abrégé/ de la Sphere & du Globe;/ Par M. DROUET, Bibliothécaire de MM./ les Avocats./ [Typ. orn.] / A PARIS,/ Chez la Veuve TILLIARD, Libraire, Quai des/ Augustins, à Saint Benoît./ [rule 54mm.] / M DCC. LXXIV./ Avec Approbation, & Privilège du Roi./

12°(162x94mm.): a⁸ b² A-K¹² L⁶ M². Pp.i-xx; 1-256.

Production, Contents: As for no.30.29, with some corrections and additions.

Copies: Ars.: 8°H.168; 8°H.169.

30.34 'Geografia de' fanciulli, ovvero Metodo breve di geografia, accomodato alla capacita' de' giovanetti, e diviso in varie lezioni, con la lista delle carte necessarie per istudiarla, del Sig. Ab. Langlet Dufresnoy. 5.ed., tradotta dal francese, nuovamente riveduta,

corretta, ed accresciuta de' nomi de' sovrani, di loro elezioni, de' cangiamenti di dominio, che facilitano lo studio; e l'uso di questa scienza. Aggiuntovi il trattato della sfera armillare.

Napoli, 1774. 19.5cm.' Nat. Union Cat. Cf. no.30.37 below.

- 30.35 'Geography for children: or, A short and easy method of teaching and learning geography ... Tr. from the French of Abbot Lenglet du Fresnoy, and now greatly augmented and improved ... The 10th ed. To which is prefixed, a method of learning geography without a master, for ... grown persons ... London, G. Keith, 1776. x, [2], 148p. fold. pl. map. 16.5cm.' Nat. Union Cat. Cf. no.30.40 below.

- 30.36 GEOGRAPHIE/ DES ENFANS,/ OU/ METHODE ABREGÉE DE LA GEOGRAPHIE;/ Divisée par Leçons, avec la Liste des/ Cartes nécessaires aux Enfans./ Par Mr. l'Abbé/ LENGLET DUFRESNOY./ [Device]/ A LAUSANNE/ Chez la Société Typographique./ [double rule]/ M. DCC. LXXVIII./

15.5cm. Pp.i-iv, 1-114, [2]. 1 fold-out map.

Copies:*Frib.: FB 159.

- 30.37 'Geografia de fanciulli ... novissimo edizione. Venezia, P. Salliani, 1779. 108p. 18cm.' Bib. Vat.: Racc.Gen Geografia V 710.Cf. no.30.41.

- 30.38 'La géographie des enfants. Amsterdam, 1780. I vol. in-12, cart.' Cat. de la Bibliothèque communale d'Abbeville (1837), Belles-Lettres, 4758.

- 30.39 'Kurzverfassete Kinder Geographie, in acht und vierzig Lectionen eingetheilet, und mit benöthigten Charten versehen. In franz.

ausgefertiget u. zum Nutzen d. Jugend in die teutsche übers.
 Neue durchaus umgearb. u. sehr verm. Aufl. Nürnberg: Monath 1781.
 55S., 8 kolor. Doppelkt.' Hessischer Zentralkatalog; Bay. Staats.

30.40 'Geography for children, or A short and easy method of teaching and learning geography. Designed principally for the use of schools ... 14th ed. To which is prefixed, A method of learning geography without a master [...] London, Printed for J. Johnson, 1783.' Nat. Union Cat. Cf. no. 30.42 below.

30.41 'Geografia de' fanciulli ovvero metodo breve di Geografia. Novissima ed. Milano, Galeazzi, 1784. 135S.' ÖEsterreichische Nationalbibliothek: 834.522.B.K. Cf. no. 30.65.

30.42 GEOGRAPHY/ FOR/ CHILDREN:/ OR,/ A Short and Easy Method of Teaching and Learning/ GEOGRAPHY:/ Designed principally for the Use of SCHOOLS./ WHEREBY/ Even CHILDREN may in a short time know the Use/ of the TERRESTRIAL GLOBE and GEOGRAPHICAL/ MAPS, and all the considerable COUNTRIES in the/ WORLD; their Situation, Boundaries, Extent, Di-/ visions, Islands, Rivers, Lakes, Chief Cities, Go-/ vernment and Religion./ Divided into LESSONS, by Way of QUESTION AND ANSWER:/ With a new General MAP of the WORLD, and also a/ LIST of MAPS necessary for Children./ Translated from the French of Abbot LENGLET DU FRESNOY,/ and now greatly augmented and improved throughout the Whole./ The FIFTEENTH EDITION./ TO WHICH IS PREFIXED,/ A Method of Learning Geography without a Master, for the Use of such/ grown Persons as have neglected this useful Study in their Youth./ AND/ A TABLE of the Latitude and Longitude of the most

remarkable Places/ mentioned in this Work./ As also a Print of the
 ORRERY./ [Ornamental rule 47mm.] / LONDON:/ Printed for J. JOHNSON,
 No. 72, St. Paul's Church-Yard, and/ E. NEWBERY, at the Corner of
 Ludgate-Street. - 1787./ [Price, bound, 1s.6d.] /

12° (161x97mm.): A-G¹². Pp.i-x, [2], 1-151, [5].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-5. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: As for 30.13 with minimal changes. There are some
 additional maps. Cf. no.30.43.

Copies: B.L.: G.129.b.16.

Nat. Union Cat.

30.43 GEOGRAPHY./ [...as for 30.42 ...] Extent, Divi-/ sions, Islands,
 Rivers, Lakes, Chief Cities, Govern-/ ment and Religion./ Divided
 into LESSONS, in the Form of/ QUESTION AND ANSWER:/ With a new
 General MAP of the WORLD, the SPHERES,/ and also a LIST of
 MAPS necessary for Children./ Translated from the French of Abbot
 LENGLET DU FRESNOY,/ and now greatly augmented and improved through
 out the Whole./ The SIXTEENTH EDITION./ TO WHICH IS PREFIXED,/ A
 Method of Learning Geography without a Master, for the Use of such/
 grown Persons as have neglected this useful Study in their Youth./
 AND/ A TABLE of the LATITUDE and LONGITUDE of the most remark-/ able
 Places mentioned in this Work./ [double rule 73mm.] / LONDON:/
 Printed for J. JOHNSON, No. 72, St. Paul's Church-Yard, and/ E.
 NEWBERY, at the Corner of Ludgate-Street. - 1791./ [Price, bound,
 1s. 6d.] /

12° (172x99mm.): a⁶ B-G¹² H⁶. Pp.i-x,[2], 1-154,[2].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-6. Catchwords on every page. Press figures.

Contents: As for 30.42, with minimal changes, e.g. in Preface. Cf. no.30.44 below.

Copies: B.L.: 570.b.31; Nat. Union Cat.

- 30.44. 'Geography for children [...as for 30.43...] the whole. 18th ed.[..]
London: Printed for J. Johnson and E. Newbery, 1795. xii, 143p.
fold. engr. front. 2 engr. maps. 17cm.' Nat. Union Cat. Cf. no.30.45.
- 30.45 'Geography for children, or A short and easy method of teaching and learning geography... 19th ed. London, T. Johnston, etc., 1795.'
Nat. Union Cat. Cf. no. 30.47.
- 30.46 'Geography for youth, Tr. from the French, and augmented. Ed. 13, Phila., 1798. 156p.' Nat. Union Cat. Cf. no.30.53.
- 30.47 'Geography for children, or A short and easy method of teaching and learning geography ... 20th ed.... London, J. Johnson, etc., 1799.'
Nat. Union Cat. Cf. no.30.48.
- 30.48 GEOGRAPHY/ FOR/ CHILDREN;/ OR,/ A Short and Easy Method of Teaching and Learning/ GEOGRAPHY:/ Designed principally for the Use of SCHOOLS./ WHEREBY/ Even CHILDREN may in a short time know the Use of the TERRESTRIAL GLOBE and GEOGRAPHICAL MAPS, and/ all the considerable COUNTRIES in the WORLD; their/ Situations, Boundaries,

Extent, Divisions, Islands, Rivers,/ Lakes, Chief Cities, Government
and Religion./ Divided into LESSONS, in the Form of/ QUESTION AND
ANSWER:/ WITH A/ New General MAP of the WORLD, the SPHERES, and also/
a LIST of MAPS necessary for Children./ Translated from the French
of Abbé LENGLET DU FRESNOY, and/ now greatly augmented and improved
throughout the Whole./ The TWENTY-SECOND EDITION./ TO WHICH IS
PREFIXED,/ A Method of Learning Geography without a Master, for the
Use of such/ grown Persons as have neglected this useful Study in
their Youth./ AND/ A Table of the LATITUDE and LONGITUDE of the
remarkable/ Places mentioned in this Work./ [ornamental rule 30mm.] /
SHREWSBURY:/ PRINTED BY SANDFORD AND MADDOCKS./ [rule 6mm.] / 1800./

12°(165x100mm.): A-F¹² G¹¹. Pp.i-xii, 1-154.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-6 (irregular). Catchwords on every page.

Contents: As for 30.43. Cf. no.30.52.

Copies: B.L.: 10004.a.70.

30.49 GEOGRAPHIE ABREGEE,/ POUR/ L'INSTRUCTION DE LA JEUNESSE./ PAR
LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ ONZIEME EDITION, entièrement refondue/
d'après les derniers traités de paix; dans/ laquelle la France
est divisée par Préfec-/ tures et sous-Préfectures; où l'on trouve/
le caractère des peuples, les productions,/ le commerce, l'étendue
et la population/ des divers États et des Villes les plus re-/
marquables; le revenu des Princes, leurs/ forces de terre et de
mer, &c./ Par J.-B. PIERRON, Prêtre, ancien/ Professeur de Rhétorique
au Collège de/ Metz./ A METZ,/ Chez DEVILLY, Libraire, rue du Petit-

Paris./ AN X.- 1802./

12°(168x97mm.): π^7 A-Y⁸⁻⁴ Z⁸. Pp.[8], i-v, 1-281.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-2. Quire catchwords.

Contents: As for no.30.33, with a number of changes and additions, and a new 'Avertissement' to replace that of Lenglet. Cf.no.30.50.

Copies: B.N.: G.10550.

- 30.50 'Géographie abrégée pour l'instruction de la jeunesse...lle éd.
entièrement refondue par J.B.Pierron [Prêtre, ci-d. Prof. de Rhétorique
au Collège de Metz.] Metz, 1803, 12°. (1Fr.80C.).' Ersch, La France
littéraire, 2e Supplément (1806), p.415. Cf. no. 30.51.
- 30.51 'Géographie abrégée... N. éd. corr., augm. et conforme au dernier
traité de paix etc. Metz, 1803, 8°. (1Fr.80C.).' Ersch, La France
littéraire, 2e Supplément (1806), pp.415-16. Cf.no. 30.57 below.
- 30.52 Geography for Children:/ OR/ A SHORT AND EASY METHOD OF TEACHING
AND LEARNING/ GEOGRAPHY./ DESIGNED PRINCIPALLY FOR THE USE OF SCHOOLS./
Whereby even Children may in a short Time/ KNOW THE USE OF/ The
Terrestrial Globe & Geographical Maps,/ AND ALL THE/ CONSIDERABLE
COUNTRIES IN THE WORLD;/ their/

SITUATION	EXTENT	ISLANDS
BOUNDARIES	DIVISIONS	RIVERS

LAKES /
CHIEF CITIES/ GOVERNMENT and RELIGION./ Divided into Lessons, in the
Form of/QUESTION and ANSWER;/ WITH A/ New general Map of the
World, the Spheres, and also a/ List of Maps necessary for Children./
Translated from the French of/ Abbot LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ [gothic

type] The Thirtieth Edition./ Comprising a short Account of the recent Changes which have taken place in various/ Kingdoms and States, to the present Time./ TO WHICH IS PREFIXED/ A Method of learning Geography without a Master,/ For the Use of such grown Persons as have neglected this useful Study in their Youth./ AND/ A TABLE of the LONGITUDE and LATITUDE of the most/ remarkable Places mentioned in this Work./ [Typ.orn.]/ [gothic type] Taunton:/ Printed by J. Poole, in Fore-street,/ For CROSBY and Co. Stationer's Court, LONDON, and for the principal/ Booksellers in Town and Country./ 1804./

12°(166x98mm.): A-L⁶. Pp.i-vi, 7-126, [2].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-3. No catchwords.

Contents: As for no.30.48 with minor changes and corrections.
Cf.no. 30.54

Copies: B.L.: 10003.b.24.

30.53 'Geography for children; or A short and easy method of teaching and learning geography: designed principally for the use of schools ...Divided into lessons, in the form of question and answer: with a list of maps necessary for children. By Abbot Lenglet du Fresnoy, and greatly augmented and improved by a teacher of Kentucky...The twentieth English and first Kentucky edition. London: Printed for S. Johnston and T. Newbury. Lexington, K. Reprinted and published by Joseph Charless. 1806. 11x17.5cm. xii, 156p.' Nat. Union Cat.

30.54 'Geography for children: or a short and easy method of teaching

and learning geography...translated from the French...and now greatly augmented and improved...To which is added a table of the latitude and longitude of the most remarkable places mentioned in this work, and preceded by a method of learning geography without a master...London, J. Johnson, 1806. vi, 137p. 3 maps, 1pl. 16°.' Nat. Union Cat.Cf.no.30.56

30.55 'Geography for youth; or, A short and easy method of teaching and learning geography...Divided into lessons by way of question and answer...Translated from the French of Abbé Lenglet du Fresnoy. And now greatly augmented and improved throughout the whole. 16th ed. To which is prefixed, A method of learning geography without a master...and to this edition is now added, A table of the latitude and longitude...also, a print of the orrery. Dublin, Printed by P. Wogan, 1806. v, [1], [7]-202p. front. (fold.map) 18cm.' Nat. Union Cat.

30.56 'Geography for children: or, A short and easy method of teaching and learning geography...Translated from the French of Abbot Lenglet du Fresnoy, and now greatly augmented and improved... Twenty-third edition... London: Printed for J. Johnson [etc.] 1809. v, 137p. incl. tables. charts, front. (map.) 17cm.' Nat. Union Cat. Cf.no.30.61

30.57 GÉOGRAPHIE/ ABRÉGÉE/ POUR L'INSTRUCTION/ DE LA JEUNESSE,/ D'APRES LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ Cinquième Edition, corrigée, augmentée et con-/ forme aux derniers traités de paix; dans laquelle/ l'Empire François est divisé par Préfectures et/ Sous-Préfectures; où l'on

trouve la situation poli- / tique de la Confédération du Rhin, des
 Royaumes / de Bavière, de Westphalie, de Saxe, etc.; le / caractère
 des Peuples, les productions, le com- / merce, l'étendue et la
 population des divers Etats / et des villes les plus remarquables;
 le revenu des / Princes, leurs forces de terre et de mer, etc. / PAR
 J.B.PIERRON, / Prêtre, ancien Professeur de Rhétorique au / Collège
de Metz. / [Miniature device: two birds on a branch] / A METZ, / Chez
 DEVILLY, Libraire, rue du Petit-Paris. / AN 1811. /

12° (170x97mm.): π^2 A-2G⁸⁻⁴ [2G2 signed 'Ff2']. Pp. [4], 1-353, [7].

Production, Contents: As for no. 30.49, with a number of augment-
 ations to the text, and without the 'Avertissement'.

Copies: B.N.: G.10551.

30.58 GÉOGRAPHIE / ABRÉGÉE / PAR DEMANDES ET RÉPONSES, / DIVISÉE EN
 LEÇONS, / POUR L'INSTRUCTION DE LA JEUNESSE, / Avec un abrégé de la
 sphère et un précis de / la Géographie ancienne et des systèmes du /
 monde; / PAR M. L'ABBÉ LENGLET DU FRESNOY. / TREIZIÈME EDITION, / ET
 SECONDE ÉDITION / Corrigée, augmentée, et contenant les changemens /
 survenus en Europe jusqu'en mai 1811, / PAR BLORDIER-LANGLOIS. /
 [Device: Intertwined letters F and M] / ANGERS, / CHEZ FOURIER-MAME,
 LIBRAIRE, RUE SAINT-LAUD. / [rule 32mm.] / M. DCCC. XI. /

12° (175x100mm.): 1-13¹². Pp. [2], i-iv, 5-310.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-2 and 5. No catchwords.

Contents: As for no. 30.49, with corrections and additions, including a new 'Avertissement'.

Copies: B.N.:G.10552.

Notes: The editor states in the 'Avertissement' that he had published a first version of this edition two years earlier. Cf. below no.30.60.

30.59 GEOGRAPHY/ FOR/ CHILDREN:/ OR,/ A short and easy Method of Teaching and Learning/ GEOGRAPHY:/ WHEREBY/ Even CHILDREN may in a short Time know the/ Use of the TERRESTRIAL GLOBES and GEOGRA-/ PHICAL MAPS, and all the considerable COUN-/ TRIES in the WORLD; their Situation, Boundaries,/ Extent, Divisions, Islands, Rivers, Lakes,/ Chief Cities, Government, and Religion./ Divided into LESSONS, in the Form of/ QUESTION AND ANSWER:/ Translated from the French of Abbot LENGLET DU/FRESNOY, and now greatly augmented and im-/ proved throughout the Whole./ THE TWENTY-FIRST EDITION./ Comprising a short Account of the recent Changes/ which have taken place in various Kingdoms and/ States./ TO WHICH IS PREFIXED,/ A Method of Learning Geography without a Master,/ for the Use of such grown Persons as have ne-/ glected this useful Study in their Youth./ [Ornamental rule]/ BRUGES:/ Printed for C.DE MOOR, Philips Stock-street,/ N.°18.-
1812/

12°(162x100mm.): π^4 1-10⁶ 11³. Pp.i-viii, 9-133.

Production: Signs. irregular. No catchwords.

Contents: As for 30.43, with abridged preface and text, and a number of corrections. Cf. no. 30.61.

Copies: B.N.: G.10445.

30.60 GÉOGRAPHIE/ ABRÉGÉE/ DE L'ABBÉ LENGLET DU FRESNOY:/ NOUVELLE
ÉDITION,/ Contenant les changemens survenus en Europe/ jusqu'en
1813; précédée d'un nouvel Abrégé/ élémentaire de Sphère; suivie
d'un Abrégé de/ Géographie ancienne, et d'un Précis historique/
sur les principales contrées du monde./ PAR BLORDIER- LANGLOIS ./
[Device : intertwined letters L & P]/ ANGERS,/ CHEZ L. PAVIE,
IMPRIMEUR-LIBRAIRE./ 1813./

12° (168x97mm.): π^3 1-13¹² 14⁸. Pp.i-viii, 1-328.

Production: Signs. arabic 1 and 5. No catchwords.

Contents: As for no. 30.58, but with a number of significant
modifications, especially as regards the historical commentaries
which have been removed from the text, and replaced by a 'précis.
historique'.

Copies: B.N.: G.10553.

30.61 'An abridgment of ancient geography; divided into short lessons, in
the form of question and answer. Intended as a sequel to the
Geography for children, written by the Abbe Langlet du Fresnoy.
London, J.Harris, 1816. 144p. 15cm.' Nat. Union Cat. Cf. no.30.71.

30.62 GEOGRAPHY/ FOR/ CHILDREN:/ OR,/ A short and easy Method of/
TEACHING AND LEARNING GEOGRAPHY./ DESIGNED PRINCIPALLY/ FOR THE USE

OF SCHOOLS:/ WHEREBY/ CHILDREN may, in a short Time, know the Use
 of the/ TERRESTRIAL GLOBE and MAPS;/ and be able to find all/
 the considerable COUNTRIES in the WORLD, and point out/ their
 Situation, Boundaries, Extent, Divisions, &c. &c./ Divided into
 LESSONS, in the Form of/ QUESTION AND ANSWER:/ WITH A NEW GENERAL
 MAP OF THE WORLD,/ AND OTHER PLATES./ Translated from the French of
 Abbot LENGLET DU FRESNOY, and now/ greatly augmented and improved
 throughout the Whole./ TWENTY-SIXTH EDITION:/ Comprising a short
 Account of the recent Changes which have/ taken place in various
 Kingdoms and States./ TO WHICH IS ADDED/ A TABLE of the LATITUDE
 and LONGITUDE of the most/ remarkable Places mentioned in this
 Work:/ AND PRECEDED BY/ A Method of Learning Geography without a
 Master, for the Use of such/ grown Persons as have neglected this
 useful Study in their Youth./ [double rule 34mm.]/ LONDON:/ PRINTED
 FOR F. C. AND J. RIVINGTON; SCATCHERD AND LET-/ Terman; G. WILKIE;
 DARTON, HARVEY, AND CO.; LONG-/ MAN, HURST, REES, ORME, AND CO.;
 JOHN RICHARDSON;/ LAW AND WHITTAKER; J. MAWMAN; J. HARRIS; BALD-/
 WIN, CRADOCK, AND JOY; WALKER AND EDWARDS; AND/ B. REYNOLDS./
 [rule 8mm.]/ 1816./ Price 2s. Bound./

12°(174x102mm.): A³ B-F¹² G⁹. Pp.i-vi, 1-138.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-2 and 5. No catchwords.

Contents: As for 30.59 with a few minor changes in the text.
 Cf. no.30.68.

Copies: B.L.: 12835.b.67.

30.63 NOUVEL ABRÉGÉ/ DES GÉOGRAPHIES/ DE NICOLE DE LA CROIX,/ CROZAT/ ET
 LENGLET-DUFRESNOY,/ PAR DEMANDES ET PAR RÉPONSES./ NOUVELLE ÉDITION,/

REVUE, et corrigée d'après les actes du Congrès de/ Vienne, les
 traités de Paris de 1814 et 1815, et/ autres;/ PRÉCÉDÉE D'UN TRAITÉ
 DE LA SPHÈRE,/ Ornée de neuf Cartes nouvellement gravées; - Mappemonde,
 -Europe, -Asie, -Afrique, -Amérique méridionale,/ -Amérique
 septentrionale, -France, -Italie, -/ Allemagne./ A L'USAGE DES
 COMMENÇANTS;/ PAR UN PROFESSEUR DE GÉOGRAPHIE./ [rule 28mm.]/ PARIS,/
 DE L'IMPRIMERIE D'AUGUSTE DELALAIN,/ LIBRAIRE, rue des Mathurins
 St.-Jacques, n°.5./ [decorative rule]/ 1816./

12°(162x100mm.): $\pi^1 a^2 1-7^{12} 8^5$. Pp.i-vi, 1-177.

Production: Signs. arabic 1 and 5. No catchwords.

Contents: This edition has no Preface, and both the content and order of the material has undergone major changes from previous editions of Lenglet's work, as is indicated in the t.-p.

The sections on 'Géographie ancienne', 'Précis d'histoire' etc. have been suppressed.

Copies: B.N.: Soc.Géog. D.2/225.

Notes: This, and subsequent French editions which reproduce it in slightly adapted versions, bear little relation to the editions published during Lenglet's lifetime. These later editions are given only brief bibliographical notices.

30.64 'Nouvel abrégé des géographies de Nicole de La Croix, Crozat et Lenglet-Dufresnoy, par demandes et par réponses. Nouvelle édition

...par un professeur de géographie [J.-A. Pannellier]. Paris, A. Delalain, 1817. In-12, vi-188p.' B.N.:G.9692. See above no. 30.63.

- 30.65 'Geografia de' fanciulli ovvero metodo breve di geografia, accomodato alla capacità de Giovanetti, diviso in lezioni, coll' indice delle carte necessarie per istudiarla. Traduzione dal francese con aggiunte. Novissima edizione; in fine della quale si dà un succinto ed essenziale trattato della sfera. Venezia, V. Rizzi, 1818. 80p. 1pl. 12°.' Nat. Union Cat.
- 30.66 'Abrégé de géographie, extrait de celles de Crozat [A. Le François], Lenglet-Dufresnoy et Nicole de La Croix, par demandes et par réponses, précédé d'un traité de la sphère d'après le système de Copernic. Édition revue...-Paris, Lecoq et Durey, 1821. In-12, vi-178p., cartes.' B.N.: G.9693. See above no. 30.63.
- 30.67 'Abrégé de géographie [as for no.30.66] In-12. vi-178p., cartes.' B.N.:G.9694. See above no. 30.63.
- 30.68 'Geography for children: or, A short and easy method of teaching and learning geography...Translated from the French of Abbot Lenglet Du Fresnoy, and now greatly augmented and improved... Thirtieth edition: comprising a short account of recent changes which have taken place in various kingdoms and states. To which is added a table of the latitude and longitude of the most remarkable places mentioned in this work, and preceded by a method of learning geography without a master... London: Printed for C. and J. Rivington [etc.] 1825. 17.5cm. v. 137p. incl. tables. diag., front., maps.' Nat. Union Cat. Cf. no. 30.71.

30.69 'Abrégé des géographies de Crozat, Nicole de La Croix et Langlet
 [sic]-Dufresnoy, par demandes et réponses, précédé d'un traité de
 la sphère d'après le système de Copernic... Nouvelle édition...
 Besançon, Montarsolo et Comp^e, 1828. In-12, 222p., cartes.'
 B.N.: G.9689. Cf. above no. 30.63. This ed. contains the 'Géographie
 ancienne'.

30.70 'Abrégé des géographies de Crozat...[etc.] 1829. Paris, Lecoq.
 In-12, vi-182p., cartes.' B.N.: G.9690. Cf. above no. 30.63.

30.71 AN ABRIDGMENT/ OF/ ANCIENT GEOGRAPHY;/ DIVIDED INTO/ SHORT LESSONS,/
 IN THE FORM OF/ QUESTION AND ANSWER./ INTENDED AS A SEQUEL TO/[gothic]
 The Geography for Children,/ WRITTEN/ BY THE ABBE LANGLET DU
 FRESNOY./ [rule 18mm.]/ THE SECOND EDITION IMPROVED./ [rule 18mm.]/
 LONDON:/ JOHN HARRIS,/ CORNER OF ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD;/ AND JOHN
 SOUTER, 73, ST. PAUL'S CHURCH-YARD./ 1829./

16°(140x110mm.): Pp.i-viii, 1-125, [18].

Contents: This is based on the 'Plan de l'ancienne Geographie'
 which under various titles formed a part of the French editions
 from no. 30.09 - 30.63; it was translated and augmented by the
 editor in 1816 (no.30.61), and published in revised form
 with a map of the ancient world.

Copies: B.L.: 010004.a.16 ; Nat. Union Cat.

30.72 'Geography for children; or, a short and easy method of teaching and learning geography... 32nd ed. - London, Longman [etc.] 1833; in-12, pl., cartes, tabl.' Cat. Coll., Berne (Fa 3290).

30.73 'Abrégé des géographies de Crozat, Nicole de la Croix et Langlet-Dufresnoy... 1834. Paris, D. Belin. In-12, viii-220p., pl. et cartes.' B.N.: G.9691. Cf. above no. 30.63 .

30.74 The geography of children or, a short and easy method of teaching or learning geography. (London 1737.) New York: Johnson, 1969. x, vii, 134p. Incl. a new preface.

30.75 J.-S. Ersch, in La France littéraire, ii, 110, asserts that Juan Manuel Giron (b.1718) translated the 'Géographie des Enfants' into Spanish. I have not located any copies of this translation.

31.01 I/[rule 123mm.]/ AVERTISSEMENT./ [rule 73mm.]/ PRINCIPES DE L'HISTOIRE, / pour l'éducation de la Jeunesse, par années & par Leçons./ Par M. L'ABBE' LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ In-12. 6. volumes, 1736. & 1737./ [Text from CET ... Volume.]/

4°(221x170mm.): π^2 . Pp.1-4.

Contents: Pp.1-4, Avertissement.

Copies: Ars.: 4°Z.2381.

Notes: The annoucement states that: 'Ce qui a fait naître l'idée de cet Ouvrage est le succès de la Géographie des Enfants, qui se vend chez les mêmes Libraires ' (p.1).

The price of the volumes is 40 sols each, bound in calfskin, except for T.II, which is 50 sols bound in one vol., or 3 livres in two; the vols. can be bought separately.

The 'Avertissement' is signed 'Chez Musier, Pere. Rollin, Fils. Debure, l'aîné.'

31.02 PRINCIPES/ DE L'HISTOIRE/ POUR L'EDUCATION/ DE LA JEUNESSE./ Par
Années & par Leçons./ PREMIERE ANNE'E./ Par M. l'Abbé LENGLET DU
FRESNOY./ [Device: cul-de-lampe, 23x44mm.]/ A PARIS,/ Chez DE BURE
l'aîné, Quay des Augustins,/ du côté du Pont S. Michel, à S. Paul./
[rule 67mm.]/ M. DCC. XXXVI./ Avec Approbation & Privilege du Roy./
T.II.

PRINCIPES/ [...]/ SECONDE ANNE'E./ [...]/ [Device: cul-de-lampe, 33x44mm.]/
[...]/ [rule 70mm.]/ M. DCC. XXXVII./ [...]
T.III.

PRINCIPES/ [...]/ TROISIE'ME ANNE'E./ Qui contient l'Histoire de
l'Empire Romain en/ Orient & en Occident, avec celle des/ Turcs,
jusques à ces derniers tems. [swash T]/ Par [...]/ [Device: cul-de-lampe,
26x36mm.]/ [...as for T.II.]

T.IV.

PRINCIPES/ [...] JEUNESSE,/ [...] / QUATRIÈME ANNÉE. / Qui contient
l'Histoire générale & particulière/ de France. / Par [...] / [Device:
 fleuron, 28x31mm.] / [...as for T.II.]

T.V.

PRINCIPES/ [...] JEUNESSE,/ [...] / CINQUIÈME ANNÉE. / Qui contient
toute l'Histoire Etrangère. / Par [...] / [Device: cul-de-lampe,
 36x36mm.] / [...as for T.II.]

T.VI.

PRINCIPES/ [...] / SIXIÈME ANNÉE. / Histoire de l'Eglise. / Par [...] /
 [Device: cul-de-lampe, 32x42mm.] / A PARIS, / Chez DE BURE l'aîné,
 Quay des Au- / gustins, du côté du Pont S. Michel, / à S. Paul. /
 [rule 65mm.] / M. DCC. XXXIX. / [...]

Variant imprints:

[A]

Ts.I-V.

[...] [Device: exactly as for no.4.01 above] / A PARIS, / Chez MUSIER
 Pere, Quay des Augustins, / du côté du Pont S. Michel, à l'Olivier. /
 [rule 67mm.] / [...]

T.VI.

[...as for variant I-V] / A PARIS, / Chez la Veuve MUSIER, Quay des Au- /
 gustins, du côté du Pont S. Michel, / à l'Olivier. / [...as for T.VI
 above.]

[B]:

Ts.I-VI.

[...] A PARIS, / Chez ROLLIN Fils, Quay des Augustins, / du côté du
 Pont S. Michel, à S. Athanase. / [...]

12° (165x99mm.): T.I. a⁸ b⁴ c⁴ A-2E⁸⁻⁴ 2F⁸ [a5 signed 'aiiii'].

Pp.i-xxiv, [8], 1-348, [4].

- T.II. a-b⁸⁻⁴ A-3H⁸⁻⁴ 3I⁶. Pp.i-xx, [4], 1-650, [10].
- T.III. a-b⁸⁻⁴ c⁶ A-2P⁸⁻⁴. Pp.i-xxxiv, [2], 1-448, [8].
- T.IV. a-b⁸⁻⁴ c⁶ A-2T⁸⁻⁴. Pp.i-xxxii, [4], 1-496, [8] (misprinting 496 as '499').
- T.V. a⁸ b² A-2T⁸⁻⁴ 2V⁴. Pp.i-xx, 1-504, [8].
- T.VI. *A-*B⁸⁻⁴ A-3F⁸⁻⁴ 3G³ * -***⁶. Pp.i-xxiii, 1-626, [4], 1-35.

Production: Signs. roman 1-4, 1-2. Quire catchwords.

Contents: T.I. P.i, t.-p.; pp.iii-xxiv, Avertissement; sign.cl-4, Table des leçons; pp.1-348, Principes de l'histoire; sign.2F7-F8, Approbation... Privilege.

T.II. P.i, t.-p.; pp.iii-x, Avertissement; pp.xi-xx, Livres necessaires; sign.b3-4, Approbation...Privilege; pp.1-650, Principes de l'histoire; sign.3I2-I6, Table des leçons.

T.III. P.i, t.-p.; pp.iii-xviii, Preface; pp.xix-xxxiv, Liste des livres necessaires; sign.c6, Approbation; pp.1-448, Principes de l'histoire; sign.2P1-P4, Table des leçons.

T.IV. P.i, t.-p.; pp.iii-xiii, Preface; pp.xiv-xxvii, Liste des livres necessaires; pp.xxviii-xxxii, Avertissement; sign.c5-c6, Approbation...Privilege; pp.1-499, Principes de l'histoire; sign. 2T1-T4, Table des leçons.

T.V. P.i, t.-p.; pp.iii-vi, Preface; pp.vii-xx, Liste des livres necessaires; pp.1-504, Principes de l'histoire; sign.2V1-V4, Table des leçons.

T.VI. P.i, t.-p.; pp.iii-x, Preface; pp.xi-xxiii, Liste des livres necessaires; pp.1-626, Principes de l'histoire; sign.3G2-G3, Table des articles; pp.1-31, Table chronologique; pp.32-5, Avertissement.

Copies: B.N.:G32134-9; G.13073-8; Ars.: 8°H.73.

Notes: There are two fold-out 'Tables chronologiques' in each of vols. I-V. The volumes were sold separately: cf. no.31.01
Most sets I have seen are composed of a mixture of volumes from the three simultaneous issues.

The appearance of vol.I was announced by the Journal des savants in Oct. 1736, p.697.

31.03 PRINCIPES/ DE L'HISTOIRE/ POUR L'EDUCATION/ DE LA JEUNESSE./ Par

Années & par Leçons./ PREMIERE ANNE'E./ Par Mr. l'Abbé LENGLET

DU FRESNOY./ [Device: as in no.27.02; 33x47mm.]/ A AMSTERDAM,/

AUX DEPENS DE LA COMPAGNIE./ MDCCXXXVII./

T.II.

[.]/ SECONDE ANNE'E./ [.]

T.III.

[.]/ TROISIE'ME ANNE'E./ Qui contient l'Histoire de l'Empire Romain en/ Orient & en Occident, avec celle des/ Turcs jusqu'à ces derniers tems./ [.]

T.IV.

[.]/ QUATRIE'ME ANNE'E./ Qui contient l'Histoire Générale & Particulière de France./ [.] MDCCXXXVIII./

T.V.

[.]/ CINQUIE'ME ANNE'E./ Qui contient toute l'Histoire Etrangère./

[.]/ MDCCXXXVIII./

T.VI.

[La Haye, 1743.] (Norddeutscher Zentralkatalog).

8° (165x107mm.): a-b⁸ A-R⁸ S⁴ [H5 signed 'A5']. Pp.i-xxiv, [8], 1-280.

T.II.*⁶*⁸ A-2G⁸ 2H². Pp.i-xx, [8], 1-483.

T.III.π¹*-***⁸ A-2G⁸ 2F⁷ [***3 signed *3]. Pp.[2], i-xxxviii, [8], 1-462.

T.IV.π⁶*⁸ ***⁸ A-2I⁸ 2K⁴ [2D4,5 signed 'D4, D5']. Pp.i-xxxviii, [6], 1-519.

T.V.π¹ *⁸ *⁴ A-2I⁸ 2K⁷. Pp.i-xxi, [5], 1-526.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-5. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: As for no.31.02.

Copies: B.L.: 9005.ccc.10; Norddeutscher Zentralkatalog; Cat.

Coll., Berne.

Notes: This was clearly a pirate edition, the successive volumes being published shortly after the appearance of their counterparts in Paris. The sixth volume appears to have been published separately, in the Hague and not Amsterdam, as late as 1743; it is lacking in many of the extant collections.

Fold-out tables as in no.31.02. (Cf. no. 31.05 below).

31.04 PRINCIPES/ DE L'HISTOIRE/ POUR L'EDUCATION/ DE LA JEUNESSE./ Par
Années & par Leçons./ PREMIERE ANNE'E./ Histoire Sainte./ Par M.
l'Abbé LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ NOUVELLE EDITION./ Revüe, corrigée &
augmentée./ [Device: medallion-shaped picture of magii presenting
gifts, signed 'M'; 29x33mm.] / A PARIS,/ chez LE CLERC, Grand'Salle
du Palais,/ à la Prudence./ [rule 56mm.] / M. DCC. LII./ Avec Approbation
& Privilege du Roi./

T.II.

[...]/ SECONDE ANNE'E./ Histoire de Grecc./ [...] agumentée./ [Device:
fleuron, 23x33mm.] / A PARIS,/ [...] Palais/ [...]

T.III.

[...]/ TROISIEME ANNE'E./ Histoire Romaine./ [...] LANGLET DU FRESNOY./
[... Device: fleuron, 25x33mm.] / [...]

T.IV.

[...]/ QUATRIEME ANNE'E./ Histoire de France./ [... Device: fleuron,
31x36mm.]/ [... rule, 60mm.]/ [...]

T.V. [...]/ CINQUIEME ANNE'E./ Histoire Etrangere./ [... Device:
as in T.III]/ [...]

T.VI.

[...]/ SIXIEME ANNE'E./ Histoire de l'Eglise./ [...] FRESNOY/
[... Device: fleuron, 25x40mm.]/ [...] Palais/[...]/ Ave Approbation
& Privilege du Roi./

Separate issues:

a. Paris, Debure l'aîné, 1752: Debure was the main publisher involved in the venture, and it is likely that a large proportion of the edition bore his imprint, of which I have not, however, seen any copies.

b. Paris, Cie des Libraires, 1752 (T.I only).

c. Paris, Ganeau, 1752 (T.I only).

d. Paris, Brocas, 1752.

e. Paris, Rollin, 1752.

12°(165x95mm.): T.I. $\pi^1 a^{12} b^4 A-Y^{12} Z^8$. Pp.[2], i-xxi, [13], 1-544.

T.II. $\pi^1 a^8 b^4 A-X^{12}$. Pp. [2], i-xx, [4], 1-495, [9].

T.III. $\pi^1 a^{12} c^6 A-T^{12}$ [P7 signed 'Pvi']. Pp. [2], i-xxxiv, [2], 1-448, [8].

T.IV. $\pi^1 a^{12} c^4 A-X^{12}$ [G1-12 signed 'F'; H2 signed 'IIii']. Pp. [2], i-xxxii, 1-496, [7].

T.V. $\pi^1 A^{10}, {}^2A-X^{12} V^2$ [K8 signed 'Kvi'; X4 signed 'Xiii']. Pp. [2], i-xx, 1-504, [4].

T.VI. $\pi^1 *A^{12} *-***^6 A-2C^{12}$ [M5 signed 'Mvi'].

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: As for no.31.02 with additions, mainly in T.I for which a new approbation was acquired.

Copies: B.N.: Rés. G.2497-502 (bound with the arms of Marie-Antoinette); Ars.: 8°H.75 (T.I); *Bibl. de la ville d'Amiens.

Notes: The 6 vols. were sold as a set for 15 livres (Mems. de Trévoux, Jan. 1753, p.190).

De Bure apparently printed an edition of 1,500 copies, which was presumably shared with Rollin and Le Clerc who had each bought a third share in the Privilège (see T.I). In 1777 there were 240 copies remaining in De Bure's stock (see Merland, 'Tirage et vente de livres', no.32).

31.05 'Principes de l'Histoire pour l'éducation de la jeunesse par années et par leçons. 6 T. Chez Arkstée et Mierkus. 8° Amsterdam et Leipzig 1756.' Biblioteca Angelica, Rome: 258 ; Hessischer Zentralkatalog.

32.01 LETTRE/ DE M. L'ABBE/ LENGLET DU FRESNOY/ A l'Auteur des Observ
ations/ sur les Ecrits modernes./ Au sujet de la Méthode pour
étudier/ la Géographie./ [Typ.orn.]/ A LA HAYE,/ Chez J. NEAULME./
[rule 60mm.]/ 1739./

12°(177x100mm.): $\pi^1 A^6 \chi^1 B^4$. Pp.[2], 1-21.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-4, 1-2. Quire catchwords.

Contents: T.-p.; pp.1-21, Lettre....

Copies: B.N.: 30911; 30912; 30913.

Notes: The typographical features strongly suggest that this pamphlet
was published in Paris.

33.01 BIBLIOTHEQUE/ DES/ PHILOSOPHES/ CHIMIQUES./ NOUVELLE EDITION,/
Revûe, corrigée & augmentée de plu-/ sieurs Philosophes, avec
des Figures/ & des Notes pour faciliter l'intelli-/ gence de leur
Doctrîne./ Par M^r. J.M.D.R./ TOME PREMIER. [TOME SECOND./ TOME
TROISIE'ME.]/ [Device: cul-de-lampe, featuring a globe; 31x46mm.]/
A PARIS,/ Chez ANDRE' CAILLEAU, Place de Sor-/ bonne, au coin de
la ruë des Maçons,/ à Saint-André./ [double rule 40mm.]/ M. DCC.
XLI/ Avec Approbation & Privilege du Roy./

T.II: [Device: cul-de-lampe, 29x42mm.] T.III: [Device: fleuron,
22x34mm.]

T.IV.

BIBLIOTHEQUE/ DES PHILOSOPHES,/ ALCHIMIQUES,/ OU HERME'TIQUES,/ CONTENANT/ Plusieurs Ouvrages en ce genre très-/ curieux & utiles,

qui n'ont point encore/ parus, précédés de ceux de Philalethe,/ augmentés & corrigés sur l'Original/ Anglois, & sur le Latin./ TOME QUATRIE'ME./ [Device: cul-de-lampe, signed 'N'; 30x50mm.]/ A PARIS,/ Chez ANDRE-CHARLES CAILLEAU,/ Libraire, Quay des Augustins, à/ l'Espérance & à S. André./ M. DCC. LIV./ [rule 68mm.]/ Avec Approbation & Privilège du Roy./ [rule 68mm.]/ Les trois premiers Volumes se vendent chez le même Libraire./

Variant t.-p.s:

BIBLIOTHEQUE/[...]. Philosophes, avec des Figu- res & des Notes pour faciliter l'intel- ligençe de leur Doctrîne./ Par Monsieur J.M.D.R./ TOME I. [TOME II./ TOME III.]/ [Device: cul-de-lampe, featuring a small lute; 23x35mm.]/ A PARIS./ Chez ANDRE CAILLEAU, Place de Sor- bonne, au coin de la ruë des Maçons,/ à S. André./ [rule 38mm.]/ M. DCC. XL./ Avec Approbation & Privilège du Roi./

Ts. II and III: [Device etc. as for 1741 version.]

12° (162x90mm.): T.I. $\pi^3 \star^6 a-m^{8-4} A-2L^{8-4} 2M^8$. Pp. [18], i-cxliv, 1-384, [40].

T.II. $\pi^2 A-2Z^{8-4} 3A^6$. Pp. [4], 1-564.

T.III. $\pi^2 A-2T^{8-4} 2U^8 2X^3$. Pp. [2], 1-522, [4].

T.IV. $\pi^4 A-2A^{8-4} 2B^4 2C^8 2D^8 2E^4 2F-3B^{8-4} 3C^8$. Pp.i-viii, 1-590, [2].

Production: Signs. roman 1-4, 1-2. Quire catchwords.

Contents: H.-t.; t.-p.; Traités contenus dans ce premier Volume; sign. $\star 1-\star 4$, Avertissement; $\star 5-\star 6$, Approbation...Privilege; pp.i-cxliv, Preface; pp.1-15, La Table d'Emeraude, de Hermes

Trismegiste; pp.16-76, Les Sept Chapitres, attribuez a Hermes;
pp.77-84, Dialogue de Marie et d'Aros; pp.85-384, La Somme de la
Perfection...de Geber; sign.2K1-2M8, Table des chapitres de la
Somme; sign. 2M8, Livres nouveaux...chez André Cailleau.

T.II. T.-p.; Traités contenus...; pp.1-55, La Tourbe des philosophes;
pp.56-111, Entretien du Roi Calid, et du Philosophe Morien; pp.112-
74, Le Livre d'Artephius; pp.175-94, Le Livre de Synesius; pp.195-
324, Le Livre de Nicolas Flamel; pp.325-99, Le livre de la philos-
ophie de Messire Bernard; pp.400-36, La Parole délaissée...de Bernard;
pp.437-46, Le Songe verd; pp.447-58, Opuscule de la philosophie...
Composée par D. Zacharie; pp.559-64, Table des chapitres.

T.III. T.-p.; Traités contenus...; pp.1-180, Les douze clefs de
philosophie de Frere Basile Valentin; pp.181-321, L'Ancienne guerre
des chevaliers, ou le triomphe hermetique; pp.322-522, La Lumiere
sortant par soi-mesme des Tenebres, poëme; sign.2X2-X3, Table des
chapitres.

T.IV. P.1, h.-t.; p.iii, t.-p.; pp.v-vi, Table des Traités; pp.vii-
viii, Approbation...Privilege; pp.1-185, Philalethe, ou l'amateur
de la verité; pp.186-233, Traité du secret de l'art philosophique...;
pp.234-94, Abregé du Traité du Grand Oeuvre des philosophes, par
Philippe Rouillac; p.295, Tome quatrième, seconde partie; pp.297-
306, L'Elucidation ou l'Eclaircissement du Testament de Raimond
Lulle; pp.307-93, Enigmes et Hieroglifs physiques, qui sont au
grand portail de l'Eglise Cathédrale...de Notre-Dame de Paris;
pp.394-460, Le Pseautier d'Hermophile; pp.461-510, Traité d'un
philosophe inconnu; pp.511-51, Lettre philosophique, Philovite a
Heliodore; pp.552-65, Préceptes et instructions du Pere Abraham

a son fils; pp.566-9, Traité du ciel terrestre; pp.570-90, Dictionnaire abrégé des termes de l'art; sign. 3C8, Fautes a corriger.

Copies: B.L.: 1035.b.1-4; B.N.: 8°R.18675; Sorb.: SO.a.32.

Notes: The printing was probably not finished until late in 1740, and so the original t.-p. was replaced by the 1741 version.

Brunet asserts that T.IV was printed in only 500 copies, as against 1.000 copies for each of the other vols., and is correspondingly rare (Manuel du libraire, i, 932).

34.01 LA/ HENRIADE/ DE M. DE VOLTAIRE./[rule 135mm.]/ AVEC/ Des Remarques, & les differences qui se trouvent dans/ les diverses Editions de ce Poëme./[Engraving: featuring a swan surrounded by other animals, signed 'Micheux In C. Sculp'; 98x130mm.]/ A LONDRES./[rule 108mm.]/ M. DCC. XLI./

4°(289x224mm.): $\pi^1 \star^3 \star\star - \star\star\star^4 A^2 B-2C^4 2D^1 a-f^4 g^2 h^4 i^2 k^1$
1-r⁴. Pp.i-xxiv,[4], 1-202, i-cxxii.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-2 for text of poem; elsewhere roman 1-2.

No catchwords for text of poem; elsewhere quire catchwords.

Press-figures on B1 and 4 verso, H1 verso, M1 recto, M3 verso, S4 recto, T2 verso, T4 recto, U1 verso, X1 and 4 verso.

The paper in gatherings A-2D is of a superior quality to that of the rest of the volume; it is watermarked CM over T.

Contents: P.i, h.-t.; p.iii, t.-p.; pp.v-vi, Avertissement du libraire; pp.vii-viii, A la Reine; pp.ix-xi, Preface de l'Edition

de 1737; pp.xii-xiv, Traduction d'une lettre de M. Antoine Cocchi; pp.xv-xvi, Preface de l'Edition de 1730; pp.xvii-xx, Histoire abrégée des événements; pp.xxi-xxiv, Idée de la Henriade; sign.A1-A2, To the Queen; pp.1-202, La Henriade; pp.i-cxiii, Remarques...; pp.cxv-cxxii, Addition aux remarques precedentes.

Copies: B.N.: Ye 1554; B.L.: c.68.d.20; Waddesdon Manor (Aylesbury, Bucks.): 704 (with ms. dedication by Voltaire to the Empress of Russia, dated 1745).

Notes: The printed sheets of the text of the poem were given to Gandouin by Voltaire himself: they include sheets from the subscriber edition of 1728, along with sheets printed in England c. 1733 (cf. Chapter V, pp.293-5). The 'Remarques...' etc. were printed in such a way that the relevant sections could be bound with each canto if the buyer so wished; many extant copies are arranged in this manner. Copies were sold without the text of the poem (see B.N.: Ye.1556); some persons who had already acquired a copy of the 1728 or 1733(?) editions of La Henriade had the 'Remarques' etc. bound in with it: see, for example, B.N.:Rés. Ye.759, which is a copy of the 1728 subscriber edition to which the 1741 material has been added. There is no indication as to how many copies of his section Gandouin printed.

There are 11 full-page engravings (frontispiece and one before each canto), and a band at the head of each canto, which were undoubtedly printed from the plates of the 1728 subscriber edition (cf. B.N., Catalogue, Voltaire no.1685, and Juliette Rigal, 'L'Iconographie de la Henriade', Studies on Voltaire, and the 18th century, xxxii, 23-71, for detailed descriptions). In the section printed by Gandouin the engraving on the title-page, and the band at the head of the 'Avertissement du libraire', were also printed from the 1728 plates, which must therefore have been transported from London to Paris sometime between 1736, when Voltaire was still trying to recover them (cf. Voltaire, Correspondence, D.1040 and D.1201), and 1741.

- 35.01 'Epître à Dom Mattheo Egittio, Bibliothécaire au Roi des Deux Siciles, 1742, in-12', attested by Hébrail and La Porte, La France littéraire, ii, 70. Lenglet announced such a work in his Lettre à l'Auteur des Observations (32.01), p.21, but Michault in 1761

had no evidence that it had been printed. (Mémoires, pp.202-3). I have not located any copy of this work.

36.01 HISTOIRE/ DE LA/ PHILOSOPHIE/ HERMETIQUE./ Accompagnée d'un Catalogue raisonné des/ Ecrivains de cette Science./ Avec le Véritable Philalethe, revû sur/ les Originaux./ TOME PREMIER./ [Device: cul-de-lampe; 33x48mm.]/ A PARIS,/ Chez COUSTELIER, Libraire, Quay/ des Augustins./ [rule 40mm.]/ M. DCC. XLII./ Avec Approbation & Privilege du Roi./

T.II.

[..]/ TOME SECOND./ [..]

T.III.

HISTOIRE/ [...] Catalogue raisonné/ des Ecrivains de cette Science./ Avec le Véritable Philalethe, revû/ sur les Originaux./ TOME III./ [Device ...]/ A PARIS,/ Chez COUSTELLIER, Libraire, Quay/ des Augustins./ [rule 40mm.]/ MDCCXLII./ Avec Approbation & Privilège du Roi./

Variant title-pages:

[A]

HISTOIRE/[...] Originaux./ Par M. l'Abbé LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ [...] / A LA HAYE./ Chez PIERRE GOSSE, Libraire./ [rule 37mm.]/ [...]

[B]

HISTOIRE/ DE LA/ PHILOSOPHIE/ HERMÉTIQUE./ Accompagnée d'un Catalogue raisonné des/ Ecrivains de cette Science./ Avec le Véritable Philalethe, revû sur/ les Originaux./ TOME TROISIE'ME./ [Device: cul-de-lampe, figuring sun in centre; 42x59mm.]/ A PARIS,/ Chez BAROIS, Quay des Augustins,/ à la Ville de Nevers./ [Triple rule 62mm.]/ M. DCC. XLIV./ Avec Approbation & Privilege du Roy./

[C]

'Histoire [..] A Paris, Chez le Clerc, 1744' (Nat. Union Cat.).

12° (165x93mm.): \tilde{a}^{12} A-X¹² Y¹. Pp.i-xxiii, 1-486, [20].

T.II. a^{12} b⁴ A-E¹², ²A-P¹². Pp.i-xxxii, 1-120, 1-360.

T.III. a^{11} A-S¹². [22], 1-432.

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: P.i, t.-p.; pp.iii-xvi, Préface; pp.xvii-xxiii, Table des articles; pp.1-458, Histoire de la philosophie hermétique [Articles I à LIV]; pp.459-86, Chronologie des plus celebres auteurs de la philosophie hermétique; sign. X4-Y1, Table des matières.

T.II. P.i, t.-p.; pp.iii-xxiv, Préface; pp.xxv-xxxii, Table des articles; p.1, h.-t.; pp.3-120, Discours preliminaire, ou histoire des transmutations metalliques; pp.1-341, Le véritable Philalethe; pp.342-60, Remarques sur les differences, qui se trouvent entre cette nouvelle Edition du Philalethe et les Anciennes.

T.III. T.-p.; sign.a2-a6, Avertissement; sign.a6-a7, Table des articles; sign.a7-all, Auteurs connus seulement depuis l'impression de ce Catalogue; pp.1-344, Catalogue des Auteurs de la Philosophie Hermetique ou Chimie Metallique; pp.345-413, Table alphabetique des auteurs et des traités de la chimie hermetique; pp.414-32, Table des matieres.

Copies: B.N.: R.41540-2; B.L.: 274.a.8-12; Bod.Ox.: 8°C.922-4Linc.

Notes: Lenglet's name did not appear in the 'Paris' issues of this edition; but the separate issue with the 'La Haye' imprint, which was probably intended for distribution outside France, did bear his name on the title-page (cf. Chapter V, p.304.). Le Clerc and Barois presumably bought copies from Coustelier, for which they printed their own title-pages in 1744.

There is a copy of T.III ('La Haye' issue) in the B.N. (Rés.R.2512) which belonged to Lenglet, and on which he has written manuscript corrections and additions, probably with the intention of publishing a second edition.

The B.N. Catalogue erroneously indicates a 'Paris' issue 'portant le nom de l'auteur', which entry has misled some bibliographers.

37.01 [Within a double rule, 118x62mm.:]

LA MESSE/ DES FIDELES,/ AVEC/ UNE EXPLICATION HISTORIQUE/ ET
DOGMATIQUE/ DU SACRIFICE/ DE LA/ SAINTE MESSE,/ ET DES PRATIQUES
DE PIETÉ [swash T three times]/ Pour honorer le Très-Saint
Sacrement, [swash T]/ avec des Maximes des Saints Peres pour/
tous les Jours du Mois./ Par M. l'Abbé LENGLET DU FRESNOY./

[Arrangement of typ.orns. in the form of a cul-de-lampe; 20x28mm.]/

A PARIS, RUE S. JACQUES,/ Chez DURAND, Libraire, à S. Landry/ &
 au Griffon./ [double rule 36mm.]/ M. DCC. XLII./ Avec Approbation &
Privilege du Roy./

Variant imprint:

[...]/ A PARIS,/ Chez DAMONNEVILLE, Quay des/ Augustins, à Saint
 Etienne./ [double rule 36mm.]/ M. DCC. XLII./ Avec Approbation &
Privilege du Roy./

12° (137x80mm.): a¹⁰ χ¹ A-H⁸⁻⁴ I⁷, ²A-Y⁸⁻⁴ Z⁴ 2A⁸ *². Pp.i-xvi,
 [6], 1-110, i-xii; ff.1-40; pp.41-246, 1-4.

Production: Signs. roman 1-4, 1-2. Quire catchwords (irregular).

Contents: P.i, h.-t.; p.iii, t.-p.; pp.v-x, A Son Altesse

Serenissime Monseigneur le Duc d'Orléans; pp.xi-xvi, Table; sign.

a9-a10, Approbation...Privilège; t.-p.; pp.1-110, Explication his-
 torique et dogmatique de la Sainte Messe; pp.i-xii, Préface;

ff.1-40, Ordinaire de la Sainte Messe; pp.41-86, Pratiques de piété; pp.87-98, Prières du matin; p.98, Prières du soir; pp.99-222, Maximes des Saints Pères; pp.223-46, Le Dimanche...; pp.1-4, Catalogue des Livres de Dévotion qui se trouvent chez le même Libraire.

Copies: B.N.: B.10586; Ars.: 8°T.5024; B.L.:4327.a.49.

Notes: The 'Explication ... de la Sainte Messe' is bound at the back in some copies.

38.01 OBSERVATIONS/ ET/ DETAILS/ Sur la Collection des Grands & des/ Petits Voyages./ [Device, 40x49mm.]/ [rule 58mm.]/ M. DCC. XLII./

4°(238x183mm.): A-E⁴ F². Pp.1-44.

Production: Signs. roman 1-3. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: P.1, t.-p.; pp.3-44, Les Grands et les Petits Voyages.

Copies: B.N.: Rés.Q.390 (with ms. notes by the abbé de Rothelin); Rés.Q.391 (with copy of de Rothelin's notes); Ge.FF.6925.

Notes: With the exception of signs. A1-2 and F2 the text is printed from the same type-setting as the 1742ed. of the Méthode pour étudier la géographie (13.06), T.I, Part 2, pp.441-82: only the signatures, catchwords and pagination have been changed. This separate edition was apparently printed in only a small number of copies, and was possibly intended solely for de Rothelin's use and distribution.

39.01 [Within a double rule, 146x82mm.:]

TABLETTES/ CHRONOLOGIQUES/ DE L'HISTOIRE UNIVERSELLE/ SACRÉE
ET PROPHANE,/ ECCLÉSIASTIQUE ET CIVILE,/ Depuis la Création du
Monde, jusqu'à l'an 1743./ AVEC/ Des Reflexions sur l'Ordre,
qu'on doit tenir & sur les/ Ouvrages nécessaires pour l'Etude
de l'Histoire./ Par M. l'Abbé LENGLET DUFRESNOY./ PREMIERE
PARTIE,/ Qui contient l'Histoire Ancienne./ [Device: cul-de-
lampe; 15x27mm.]/ A PARIS,/ Chez [6 lines enclosed in an ornam-
ental bracket] DE BURE l'aîné, Quay des Augustins, du côté/ du
Pont S. Michel, à S. Paul./ ET/ GANEAU, Libraire, rue S. Jacques,
vis-à-vis/ S. Yves, à S. Louis./ [rule 35mm.]/ M. DCC. XLIV./
AVEC APPROBATION ET PRIVILEGE DU ROY. [swash Y]/

T.II.

[..]/ SECONDE PARTIE,/ Qui contient l'Histoire Moderne./ [...]

Variant title-page:

T.II.

[..] UNIVERSELLE,/ [...] l'an 1742./ SECONDE PARTIE,/ Qui contient
l'Histoire Moderne./ [...] / M. DCC. XLII./ Avec Approbation &
Privilege du Roi./

8°(170x105mm.): *⁷ a-n⁸ A-H⁸ I⁸ (± 12) K-Z⁸. Pp. [14], i-ccviii,
1-367.

T.II. *--***⁸ A-2B⁸ 2C⁸ (±2C1) 2D-E⁸ 2F-I⁴ 2K³. Pp.i-xlvihi,
1-483, [3].

Production: Signs. roman 1-4. Quire catchwords.

Contents: *1, t.-p.; sign.*2-*4, Epitre: A Son Eminence Monseigneur
le Cardinal de Passionei; sign.*5-*7, Table des chapitres; pp.i-

clxxvi, Discours préliminaire sur la manière abrégée d'étudier l'histoire; pp. clxxvii-ccviii, Liste des livres nécessaires pour l'étude de l'histoire; pp. 1-357, Table [et tablettes] chronologique de l'histoire universelle; pp. 358-66, Table alphabétique; p. 367, Fautes à corriger.

T. II. P. i, t. -p.; pp. iii-x, Avertissement; p. x, Avis particulier; pp. xi-xiv, Table des articles; pp. xv-xvii, Liste des Papes; pp. xviii-xxii, Supplément pour la colonne des conciles; pp. xxiii-xlvi, Supplément pour la colonne des écrivains ecclésiastiques; pp. 1-208, Table chronologique de l'histoire moderne; pp. 209-439, Tablettes...; pp. 440-83, Table alphabétique; sign. 2K2-2K3, Approbation... Privilege du Roy; sign. 2K3, Avertissement.

Copies: B.N.: G.13046-7; Maz.: 41932; Ars.: 8°H.1788¹⁻².

Notes: This work was published in Oct. 1743, after a considerable delay due to one of Lenglet's imprisonments. (cf. Chapter V, note 231); this necessitated the printing of the updated '1744' title-page.

In volume II a carton had to be printed to replace a page where Lenglet made one of his habitual attacks on Jesuit authors (see his Lettre à l'auteur des Observations, p. 19, where he draws attention to this fact).

39.02 TABLETTES/ CHRONOLOGIQUES/ DE/ L'HISTOIRE UNIVERSELLE,/ SACRÉE
ET PROFANE /ECCLESIASTIQUE ET CIVILE ,/ DEPUIS LA CRÉATION DU
MONDE, JUSQU'À/ L'AN M. DCC. XLIII./ AVEC/ Des Réflexions sur l'Ordre
qu'on doit tenir, & sur les/ Ouvrages nécessaires pour l'Etude de
l'Histoire./ PAR/ M. L'ABBE LENGLET DUFRESNOY./ PREMIER VOLUME,/
Qui contient l'Histoire Ancienne. / [Device: Mercury in a library,
ship in the background, signed 'FHS N°5'; 38x57mm.] / A LA HAYE,
[swash Y] / Chez FREDERIC-HENRI SCHEURLEER./ M. DCC. XLV./

T.II.

[...]/ SECOND VOLUME,/ Qui contient l'Histoire Moderne./ [...]

8°(198x136mm.): *⁴ **⁴ a-o⁸ A-Z⁸ 2A². Pp. [16], i-ccxxiv, 1-372.

T.II. π² *-**⁸ A-2H⁸ 2I². Pp. [4], i-xlvi, 1-500.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-5. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: As for no. 39.01, with a number of corrections and revisions of a minor nature. Cf. no. 39.06 below.

Copies: B.N.: G.13048-9; *Konink. Bib.; *Cat. Coll., Berne.

39.03 'Tavolette Chronologiche della Storia Universale sacra e profana, Ecclesiastica & Civile, dalla creazione del Mondo, sino all' anno 1743. Con riflessioni sopra l'ordine, che dee tenersi nello studio della Storia, e sopra i libri per cio necessari opera del Sig. Abbate Lenglet Dufresnoy, tradotta dalla Lingua Francese nell' Italiana. Venezia, Occhi, 1748. in-4.' Announced in La Bibliothèque annuelle, i, 235, and the Mémoires de Trévoux, Aug. 1748, p.1703. Cf. no. 39.04.

39.04 'Tavolette Chronologiche [... as for no. 39.03] 2 vol. 12°. 17.5cm.'

*Bib. Vat.: Chigi v 3278; Nat. Union Cat..

39.05 [In gothic type:]
Chronologische Tafeln/ der/ Allgemeinen Historie/ mit Betrachtungen/
über die/ nötige Ordnung und Bücher/ die historie zu erlernen/
verfertigt/ vom/ herrn Abt Lenglet Dufresnoy./ Mit einer Vorrede/
D. Siegm. Jac. Baumgartens./ [rule 59mm.]/ Erster Theil/ der die

alte Geschichte/ enthält./[Device: 51x70mm.]/[rule 98mm.]/
 Mit Königl. Poln. und Churfürstl. Sächs. allergnäd. Freiheit./
 [rule 97mm.]/ HALLE, bey Joh. Justinus Gebauer. 1752./

T.II.

Chronologische [...] Dufresnoy./[rule 67mm.]/ Zweiter Theil/
 der/die neuere Geschichte/ enthält./[...]

8°(198x123mm.):)(⁸₂)(²a-1⁸m⁴A-Y⁸Z²*⁴*¹; 2^{A-C}⁸2^D⁴2^E¹.
 Pp.[20], 1-540, [10], 1-58(misprinting 540 as '954').

T.II. (a)-(c)⁸(d)⁴(A)-2(H)⁸2(I)¹. Pp.1-56, 1*-414*, 415-98.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-5. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: T.I. T.-p.; sign.)(2-2)(2, Vorrede [signed Baumgarten];
 pp.1-144, Vorläufige Einleitung...; pp.145-84, Verzeichnis der zur
 Erlernung der Geschichte nötigen Bücher; pp.185-540, Chronologische
 Tafel...; sign.*1-E1, Christoph Matth. Möllings ... Entwurf einer
 Chronologie der heiligen Schrift.

T.II. T.-p.; pp.3-56, Einleitung in den andern Theil; pp.1*-222*,
 Chronologische Tafeln der neuern Geschichte; pp.223*-447, Tafeln zur
 Kirchengeschichte; pp.448-98, Verzeichnis der vornehmsten personen
 und Sachen.

Copies: Bod.Ox.: Vet.D5e.253-4; *⁸Oster.Nat.: 70.S.21; Nat.Union Cat.

Notes: There is one fold-out table in T.I. Cf. no. 39.12 below.

39.06 'Tablettes chronologiques de l'histoire universelle, sacrée et
 profane, ecclésiastique et civile, depuis la création du monde

jusqu'à l'an 1743 [...] Par Lenglet Dufresnoy. 3.éd. 2vol. La Haye: Scheurleer 1756. 8°. ' Union Cat., Konink. Bib.; Hessischer Zentralkatalog. Cf. no.39.02.

- 39.07 'Chronological tables of universal history, sacred and profane, ecclesiastical and civil: from the creation of the world, to the year one thousand seven hundred and forty-three. With a preliminary discourse on the short method of studying history; and a catalogue of books necessary for that purpose; with some remarks on them. By Abbé Lenglet Dufresnoy. In two parts. Tr. from the last French edition, and continued down to the death of King George II... [by Thomas Flloyd] London, Printed for A.Millar, 1762. 2v. 21cm.' Nat. Union Cat.; *B.L.: 303.i.16-17; *Trinity Coll., Cambridge. Cf. below no.39.10.

- 39.08 [Within a double rule, 152x86mm.:]

TABLETTES/ CHRONOLOGIQUES/ DE/ L'HISTOIRE/ UNIVERSELLE,/ SACRÉE ET
PROPHANE,/ ECCLÉSIASTIQUE ET CIVILE,/ Depuis la Création du monde,
jusqu'à l'an 1762;/ AVEC/ Des Réflexions sur l'ordre qu'on doit
tenir, & sur les/ Ouvrages nécessaires pour l'Étude de l'Histoire./
 Par M. l'Abbé LENLETT DUFRESNOY./ TOME PREMIER;/ QUI CONTIENT
L'HISTOIRE ANCIENNE./ Nouvelle Edition, revue, corrigée & augmentée./
 [Typ.orn.]/ A PARIS,/ Chez [ornamental bracket enclosing 4 lines]
 DE BURE Pere, Quai des Augustins, du côté du/ Pont Saint Michel, à
 Saint Paul./ GANEAU, Libraire, rue Saint Severin, aux Armes/ de
 Dombes./ [double rule 59mm.]/ M. DCC. LXIII./ AVEC APPROBATION ET
PRIVILÉGE DU ROI./

T.II.

[..]/ AVEC des Réflexions sur l'ordre qu'on doit tenir, &/ sur les Ouvrages nécessaires pour l'Etude de l'Histoire./ Par[..]/
TOME SECOND;/ QUI contient la premiere Section de l'Histoire Moderne, ou/ la Table Chronologique des Évenemens, depuis la Naissance/ de JÉSUS-CHRIST, jusqu'à la fin de 1762./ Nouvelle [..]

T.III.

[... as for T.II]/ TOME TROISIÈME;/ QUI contient la seconde Section de l'Histoire Moderne, ou/ les Tablettes de l'Histoire Ecclésiastique & de l'Histoire Civile, / & celle des Sciences & des Beaux-Arts./ [..]

8°(170x103mm.): a⁸(±a4),²a-m⁸,A-N⁸ O⁸(±03) P-2H⁸ 2I³ 2K⁸ 2L⁴. Pp.[16],
i-cxcii, 1-525.

T.II.*⁶ A-T⁸ V³ (±V3). Pp.i-xii, 1-310.

T.III. a⁴ V⁵ X-3I⁸ 3K². Pp.i-viii, 311-882,[2].

Production: Signs. roman 1-4. Quire catchwords.

Contents: As for no.39.01, with the additions indicated in the title-page; some alterations in the arrangement of the material;a number of additional essays by other authors at the end of T.I; Supplements to the 'Table des anciens Ecrivains' (T.I); a new 'Table Chronologique des Grands Hommes qui se sont distingués dans les Sciences et les Beaux-Arts.'

Copies: B.N.: G.13051-2; Ars.:8°H.1791¹⁻³; B.L.: 592.a.24-5.

Notes: The edition was clearly planned as 2 tomes, but it was subsequently found desirable to subdivide T.II because of its unwieldly

size; some copies are nonetheless bound in 2 vols.
 The original 'Avertissement' was altered to up-date and correct the information it offered (sign. a4, carton).
 Re the editors of this edition cf. Chapter V, p.376, note 255.

39.09 [Within a double rule, 150x82mm.:]

TABLETTES/ CHRONOLOGIQUES/ DE/ L'HISTOIRE/ UNIVERSELLE,/ SACRÉE ET
PROFANE,/ ECCLÉSIASTIQUE ET CIVILE,/ Depuis la Création du Monde
jusqu'à l'an 1775;/ AVEC/ Des Réflexions sur l'ordre qu'on doit
tenir, & sur les/ Ouvrages nécessaires pour l'étude de l'Histoire./
 Par M. l'Abbé LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ TOME PREMIER;/ CONTENANT L'HISTOIRE
ANCIENNE. [TOME SECOND./ CONTENANT L'HISTOIRE MODERNE.]/ Nouvelle
 Édition, revue, corrigée & augmentée/ Par J.L. BARBEAU DE LA
BRUYERE./ [Typ.orn.]/ A PARIS,/ Chez [ornamental bracket enclosing
 4 lines] les Frères DE BURE, Libraires, Quai des/ Augustins./ P.M.
DELAGUETTE, Libraire-Imprimeur,/ rue de la Vieille-Draperie./
[ornamental rule 52mm.]/ M. DCC. LXXVIII./ Avec Approbation &
Privilege du Roi./

8°(169x105mm.): $\pi^2 a^8, {}^2a-o^8 p^4 A^4 B-2H^8 2I^8 (\pm 2I4.5) 2K-Q^8 2R^7$.

Pp. [20], i-ccxxx, [2], 1-623, [3].

T.II. $\pi^2 a^8 A-3H^8 3I^4$. Pp. [4], i-xv, 1-872.

Production: Signs. roman 1-4. Quire catchwords.

Contents: As for no.39.08, with a number of minor additions;
 the various tables of names have been incorporated into one 'Table
 Alphabétique des noms'.

Copies: B.N.: G.13053-4; Ste.Gen.: Δ 52444; B.L.: 681.a.16.

Notes: Signs. 2I4 and 5 are in fact present in one copy I have seen of T.I: they were a h.-t. and t.-p. for that volume, advertising 'Tablettes' only up to the year 1774, and with a 1777 colophon.

39.10 CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES:/ EXHIBITING/ EVERY REMARKABLE OCCURRENCE/
FROM THE/ Creation of the World;/ WITH CHARACTERISTIC TRAITS OF
EACH EVENT./ Chiefly abridged from the French of/ THE ABBOT LENGLET
DU FRESNOY./ Arranged Alphabetically, and augmented from Authentic
Sources/ TO THE/ Present Time;/ PARTICULARLY AS REGARDS BRITISH
HISTORY./ Comprehending/ Brief Accounts of Inventions and Discoveries
in every Depart-/ ment of Science; and Biographical Sketches of Three
Thou-/sand Illustrious or Notable Persons./ WITH A FRONTISPIECE. [swash
T twice]/ [double rule: 71mm.]/ LONDON:/ PRINTED FOR VERNOR & HOOD;
W. PEACOCK; J. RIDGWAY;/ CROSBY & LETTERMAN; T. HURST; AND J. BADCOCK,/
By J.D. Dewick, Aldersgate-street./ [double rule 8mm.]/ 1801./

12° (142x85mm.): A⁴ B-Y⁶ Z². Pp.i-v, [3], 1-256.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-3. No catchwords: Numerous press-figures.

Contents: P.i, t.-p.; pp.iii-v, Preface; sign. A4, Analytical Table; sign. A4, The reader is respectfully informed...; pp.1-256, Chronological Tablets.

Copies: B.L.: 9009.a.5.

Notes: There is an engraved Frontispiece. This short work bears little resemblance to the French editions, and contains none of the 'additional' material; it is arranged in alphabetical, not chronological order. It would appear that the editor used Lenglet's name chiefly to add respectability to his work. Cf. below no.39.15.

39.11 TABLETTES/ CHRONOLOGIQUES,/ DE/ L'HISTOIRE UNIVERSELLE,/ SACRÉE ET PROFANE,/ ECCLÉSIASTIQUE ET CIVILE,/ Depuis la création du monde jusqu'à l'année 1808./ OUVRAGE/ Rédigé d'après celui de l'abbé LENGLET DU FRESNOY,/ Par JEAN PICOT ,/ De Genève, Professeur d'histoire et de statistique dans/ l'académie de cette ville, membre associé de l'académie/ des sciences, belles-lettres et arts de Besançon, etc./ TOME PREMIER. [TOME SECOND/ TOME TROISIÈME]/ [ornamental rule 28mm.]/ A GENÈVE,/ Chez MANGET ET CHERBULIEZ, Libraires./ 1808./

8° (203x122mm.): $\pi^2 a-c^4 d^2 A-4B^4 \chi^2$. Pp. [4], i-xxvi, [2], 1-589.

T.II. $\pi^2 A-4F^4 4G^3$. Pp. [4], 1-605.

T.III. $\pi^2 A-3Q^4 3R^3$. Pp. [4], 1-501.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-2 (irregular). Quire catchwords. No press-figures.

Contents: Based on no. 39.09, with significant changes and additions, especially in the section on modern history; the 'Discours préliminaire' has been suppressed.

Copies: B.L.: 9012.fff.12; *Trinity Coll., Cambridge: u.13.28-30;

*Bibl.mun. de Lille.

39.12 'Chronologische Tabellen der allgemeinen Weltgeschichte von der Schöpfung bis auf das Jahr 1808. Nach dem Werke des Abbé Lenglet Du Fresnoy herausgegeben von Jean Picot. Aus dem Französischen übersetzt. Theil 1.2.3. Leipzig 1809-10. E.F. Steinacker.'

Bay. Staats.

39.13 CHRONIQUE/ DES/ ÉVÉNEMENS POLITIQUES,/ CIVILS, MILITAIRES,/ RELIGIEUX, PHILOSOPHIQUES, SUPERSTITIEUX, etc.,/ DE TOUS LES PEUPLES;/ HISTOIRE IMPARTIALE ET ANECDOTIQUE./ DEPUIS L'ÈRE CHRÉTIENNE JUSQU'EN 1823./ Ouvrage rédigé d'après celui de l'abbé L'ENGLET-DUFRESNOY,/ augmenté de toutes les omissions faites par cet auteur;/ Contenant plus de seize mille articles nouveaux; toutes les Sectes/ anciennes et modernes; des Anecdotes curieuses sur l'histoire,/ sur la religion et sur la philosophie; les Traités de paix et Conven-/ tions depuis le 15e siècle; et enfin une Chronique circonstanciée/ des événemens de la révolution française./ ORNÉ DE ONZE CENTS PORTRAITS EN MÉDAILLONS./ PAR L. PRUDHOMME,/ MEMBRE DE PLUSIEURS SOCIÉTÉS LITTÉRAIRES./ *Damnosa quid non imminuit dies:/ Ætas parentum, pejor avis, tulit/ Nos nequiores, mox futuro/ Progeniem vitiosiore.* HORAT./ TOME PREMIER./ [rule 8mm.]/ PARIS,/ PRUDHOMME FILS, ÉDITEUR, RUE DES MARAIS, N° 18./ 1822./

8° (250x125mm.): 1⁶ 2-30⁸ 31⁶. Pp.1-490, [2].

Contents: Based on the tables of no.39.09, greatly augmented, from which all comments betraying the author's 'partialité' have been removed. This vol. ends with the year 799.

Copies: B.N.: G.27870.

Notes: I have found no indication as to whether the later vols. of this work were ever published.

39.14 'Abrégé chronologique de l'histoire universelle ancienne et moderne, par Lenglet Dufresnoy. Nouvelle édition, revue, et continuée jusqu'en

1823. A Paris, chez Ménard et Desenne, fils, Libraires, éditeurs
du nouveau dictionnaire historique, rue Git-le-Coeur; n°8. 1823.
2 tomes, pp.476; 499. 21cm.' Frib.: Fg 639.

39.15 A/ CHRONOLOGICAL SKETCH/ OF/ CHURCH HISTORY,/ CHIEFLY EXTRACTED/
[gothic type] From the Tables/ OF THE/ ABBE DUFRESNOY;/ DESIGNED
FOR/ STUDENTS IN DIVINITY./[ornamental rule 8mm.]/ CAMBRIDGE:/
PRINTED BY AND FOR J. HALL;/ G. B. WHITTAKER, & CO./ AND HAMILTON,
ADAMS, AND CO. LONDON./[rule 7mm.]/ 1830/

138x81mm.:π⁴ A-B⁹ C⁵. Pp.i-viii, 1-45.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-5. No catchwords.

Contents: T.-p.; pp.iii-viii, Summary observations; pp.1-45, The
First Century of the Christian ÂEra [-Century XIX].

Copies: B.L.: 4520.a.13.

Notes: Unlike no.39.10, this Table does follow a chronological
arrangement; there is no reference to Lenglet in the introduction.

40.01 CATULLUS,/ TIBULLUS,/ ET/ PROPERTIUS,/ Priſtino nitori reſtituti,
& ad optima/ Exemplaria emendati./ ACCEDUNT/ Fragmenta CORNELIO
GALLO inſcripta./[Device: man picking leaf off a tree, and a
scroll marked 'NON SOLUS'; 30x38mm.]/ LUGDUNI BATAVORUM./[rule 53mm.]/
M. DCC. XLIII./

Variant imprint:

... /LUTETIAE PARISIORUM./ Apud ANT. URB. COUSTELIER./[rule 53mm.]/[. .]

12°(153x85mm.): \tilde{a}^8 A-2E⁸⁻⁴ 2F⁴. Pp.i-xvi, 1-344.

Production: Signs. roman 1-4, 1-2. Quire catchwords.

Contents: P.i, t.-p.; pp.iii-vi, Typographus lectoris; pp.vii-ix, Caii Valerii Catulli Vita; pp.x-xvi, Specimen emendationum; pp.1-96, C. Valerii Catulli Veronensis; p.97, h.-t.; pp.99-168, Albii Tibulli equitis romani elegiarum; p.169, h.-t.; pp.171-304, Sex. Aurelii Propertii elegiarum; pp.305-36, CN. Cornelii Galli Fragmenta; pp.337-44, Verba obsoleta quae leguntur in Catullo.

Copies: B.N.: Yc.5148; B.L.: 673.a.15; Bod.Ox.: Buchanan f. 121.

Notes: There is a frontispiece and two other full-sized engravings in this volume.

Some copies have a t.-p. or h.-t. with the variant imprint. See no. 40.02 for separate issue.

40.02 [Separate issue of 40.01 in 3 vols.:]

T.I. As for 40.01, variant imprint.

T.II.

ALBII/ TIBULLI/ EQUITIS ROMANI/ ELEGIARUM/ ALIORUMQUE CARMINUM/
LIBRI IV./ AD OPTIMOS CODICES EMENDATI./ [Device...as for t.I.]

T.III.

SEX. AURELII/ PROPERTII/ ELEGIARUM/ LIBRI IV./ AD OPTIMOS CODICES/
NUNC DENUO EMENDATI./ [Device...]

12°(158x87mm.): \tilde{a}^8 A-H⁸⁻⁴ I⁴. Pp.i-xvi, 1-104.

T.II. A-F⁸⁻⁴ G⁴ H-I⁸⁻⁴. Pp.1-104.

T.III. A-K⁸⁻⁴ L⁸. Pp.1-136.

Contents: Exactly as for 40.01.

Copies: B.N.: Rés. Vélins 2073-5.

Notes: This issue was undoubtedly printed from the same type-setting as 40.01, with new signs. and pag. in Ts.II and III, and was seemingly composed only of copies on velum. There were, however, other velum copies in three vols., with the signs. and pag. etc. identical to 40.01.

40.03 CATULLUS,/ TIBULLUS/ ET/ PROPERTIUS,/ Pristino nitori restituti,
& ad optima/ Exemplaria emendati,/ Cum Fragmentis C. GALLO inſcriptis./
[Device: similar to 40.01]/ PARISIIS, Typis J. BARBOU, viâ San-
Jacobeâ./ [double rule 47mm.]/ M. DCC. LIV./

Variant title-page:

C. VALERIUS/ CATULLUS,/ Pristino nitori restitutus, & ad optima/
Exemplaria emendatus./ Cum Fragmentis C. GALLO inſcriptis./ [Device:
as above]/ LUTETIAE PARISIORUM,/ Typis JOSEPHI BARBOU./ [double rule
46mm.]/ M DCC LIV./

12°(158x87mm.): Signs. and pag. as for 40.01.

Production, Contents: As for 40.01, with 3 additional half-title
pages.

Copies: B.N.: Yc.5151; Ste.Gen.: OE.v.8°814. Inv.1707 Rés.;

Ars.: 8°B.4280.

Notes: Although the lay-out of this edition is almost identical to no.40.01, it is not printed from standing type.

41.01 MEMOIRES/ DE CONDÉ,/ SERVANT D'ÉCLAIRCISSEMENT/ ET DE PREUVES A
 L'HISTOIRE/ DE M. DE THOU,/ TOME SIXIÈME./ OU/ SUPPLEMENT/ Qui
contient la Legende du CARDINAL DE LORRAI-/ NE, celle de DOM
CLAUDE DE GUISE, & l'Apo-/ logie & Procès de JEAN CHASTEL, &
autres, avec/ des Notes Historiques, Critiques & Politiques./
 [Device: fleuron, 35x55mm.]/ A LA HAYE,/ Chez PIERRE DE HONDT./
 [Triple rule: 77mm.]/ M. DCC. XLIII./

Variant title-pages:

[A]
 MEMOIRES/ DE CONDÉ,/ SERVANT D'ÉCLAIRCISSEMENT/ Et de Preuves à

 l'Histoire/ DE M. DE THOU,/ TOME SIXIÈME./ OU/ SUPPLEMENT/ Qui

contient la Legende du CARDINAL DE LORRAINE, celle/ de DOM CLAUDE
DE GUISE, & l'Apologie & Procès de JEAN/ CHASTEL, & autres, avec des
Notes Historiques, Critiques, & Politiques./ [Device: similar to no.
 39.02, signed 'Cl. Duflos Sculpsit'; 58x89mm.]/ A LA HAYE,/ Chez
 PIERRE DEHONDT./ [Double rule 65mm.]/ MDCCXLIII./

[B]
 MEMOIRES/ DE/ CONDÉ,/ OU RECUEIL POUR SERVIR À/ L'HISTOIRE DE FRANCE,/

 Contenant ce qui s'est passé de plus mémorable dans le/ Royaume,
 sous le Regne de FRANCOIS II, &/ sous une Partie de celui de CHARLES
 IX,/ OU L'ON TROUVERA DES PREUVES DE/ L'HISTOIRE DE M. DE THOU:/ TOME

 SIXIEME,/ CONTENANT/ LA LEGENDE DU CARDINAL DE LORRAINE. CELLE/ DE
DOM CLAUDE DE GUISE. L'APOLOGIE/ ET LE PROCES DE JEAN CHASTEL;/ Et
autres Pièces, avec des Notes Historiques, Cri-/ tiques, & Politiques./

 [Device: cul-de-lampe, 40x78mm.]/ A PARIS,/ Aux DEPENS DE L'EDITEUR,/

 M. DCC. XLIII./

4° (258x215mm.): $\pi^2 \tilde{a}^4 \tilde{e}^4 \tilde{i}^4 \tilde{o}^4 \tilde{u}^4, 2\tilde{a}^4 2\tilde{e}^2, A-2B^4 2C^2, 3\tilde{a}^2, 2A-S^4$

$2_T^2, 4\tilde{a}^4, 3A-2P^4$. Pp. [4], i-x1, i-ix, [3], 1-204, i-iv, 1-147, i-viii,
 1-303.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-3. Catchwords on every page. Water-mark 'DANCOUMOIS FIN'.

Contents: H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-xxxv, Avertissement; p.xxxv, Avis; pp.xxxvi-xl, Differences des deux editions du livre de Jean Mariana; p.i, h.-t., Premiere Partie; p.ii, Liste des Pièces; pp.iii-ix, François de L'Isle aux lecteurs; sign. ²ē2, Avis au relieur; pp.1-115, La Legende de Charles Cardinal de Lorraine; pp.116-34, Harenga; pp.135-63, La Guerre Cardinale; pp.163-88, Brief Discours [suite de la Guerre Cardinale]; pp.189-204, Table des matieres; p.i, h.-t., Seconde Partie; pp.ii-iv, Sommaire des Chapitres; pp.1-139, Legende de Domp Claude de Guise; pp.140-7, Table des matieres; p.i, h.-t., Troisieme Partie; p.ii, Avis de l'auteur de l'Apologie; pp.iii-viii, Sommaire des matieres; p.viii, Sonnet; pp.1-120, Apologie pour Jehan Chastel; pp.121-4, Advertissement aux Catholiques; pp.125-6, Copie de la lettre du Roy; pp.126-46, Procedure faicte contre Jean Chastel; p.147, h.-t.; pp.149-97, Histoire abregée du procès criminel de Jehan Chastel; p.199, h.-t.; p.200, Avis au lecteur; pp.201-86, Procès, examen [... de] François Ravailac; pp.287-303, Table des matieres.

Copies: B.N.: La²⁴ 4; B.L.: 1319.1.8; Bod.Ox.: Meerman 342.

Notes: There is an engraved portrait of 'Charles, Cardinal de Lorraine', as frontispiece.

On the relationship between this volume and the Mémoires de Condé, vols.I-V, edited by Secousse, see Chapter V, pp.307ff. The main title-page for the Secousse edition, with the colophon 'A Londres, Chez Claude du Bosc & Guillaume Darrés. A Paris, Chez Rollin Fils, Quai des Augustins, à S. Athanase. M. DCC. XLIII.', does not mention the Supplément; but a second title-page, which corresponds typographically to variant t.-p. [A] above, explicitly advertises the Supplément and its contents. These latter t.-p.s may have been printed for copies sold outside France.

Variant t.-p. [B] above appears to be rare, and may have been intended only for copies distributed privately by editor or publisher.

The Projet de souscription for the Mémoires de Condé ('Londres, chez Claude du Bosse, J. Nillor & Compagnies') stated that there would be 500 small-paper, and 50 large-paper copies printed; we have no evidence as to the number of copies of the Supplément which Rollin printed, but in view of the unorthodox nature of the material, it may well have been larger than the edition of the first 5 vols. We do know that after Lenglet's arrest Rollin was obliged to send almost 500 copies to the Chambre syndicale, and that an order was issued for their destruction (see Chapter V, p.313). The Supplément was also produced in both small and large-paper copies.

41.02 The 'Nouvelles de la Haye' in the Journal des savants, June 1744, p.383 announced: 'On trouve en cette Ville une Brochure de 170 pag. contenant un Recueil de divers morceaux de l'Histoire de France nouvellement réimprimés sous le titre de Supplément aux Mémoires de Condé, quatrième partie, &c. 1744. in 4°.' This was clearly Part IV of edition no. 41.03, which appears to have been printed before the main body of the work, and sold separately. This report would suggest that 41.03 was published in the Hague.

41.03 MÉMOIRES/ DE/ C O N D É,/ TOME SIXIEME./ NOUVELLE EDITION [swash T]/
 AUGMENTÉE, [swash U, T]/ Non seulement de NOUVELLES REMARQUES, mais
encore/ des deux Pièces suivantes:/ [in left-hand column] I. L'ANTI-
 COTTON, où l'on prouve/ que les Jésuites sont les Auteurs/ de
 l'Assassinat de Henry IV, Roy/ de France, précédé de l'Histoire/
 Littéraire & Critique de ce fa-/ meux Ouvrage;/ [in right-hand
 column] II. L'ASSASSINAT DU ROY,/ ou Maximes du Vieil de la Montagne
 Vaticane, & de ses/ Moines Assassins, practiquées/ en la Personne de
 Henry le Grand; [end of columns]/ Accompagnées d'amples REMARQUES
Historiques & Critiques./ [Device: cul-de-lampe; 47x75mm.]/ A PARIS,/
 Aux Frais & Dépens de l'Editeur,/ M. DCC. XLV./

Variant title-page:

MÉMOIRES/ POUR SERVIR À/ L'HISTOIRE/ DE CHARLES IX,/ ET DE HENRI IV,/
 ROIS DE FRANCE:/ CONTENANT [swash T twice]/ EN QUATRE PARTIES,/ LES
 PIÈCES IMPORTANTES, DONT ON PEUT VOIR/ LES TITRES DANS LA TABLE
 SUIVANTE;/ ET QUANTITÉ' DE/ REMARQUES HISTORIQUES ET CRITIQUES,/
 QUI SERVENT À LEUR ÉCLAIRCISSEMENT./ [Device: cul-de-lampe; 43x84mm.]/
 A PARIS,/ Aux Frais & Dépens de l'Editeur,/ M. DCC. XLV./

4° (257x200mm.): $\pi^1 \star^2 a-d^4 e^2 2a^4 [b]^1 \pi^1 A-2B^4 2C^2, 2A-X^4, 3a^4,$
 $3A-2Z^4 3A^2, 4A-X^4 Y^2$. Pp. [6], i-xxxvi, i-x, [2], 1-204, 1-170, i-viii,
 1-372, 1-44, [2], 45-170.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-3. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: As for no. 41.01, with the addition of a few minor notes, and a new 'Quatrième partie' as follows:

Sign.⁴ A1, h.-t.; pp.3-4, Avertissement de l'Editeur; pp.6-44, Dissertation historique et critique sur l'Anti-Cotton; h.-t.; p.45, A la Royne; p.46, Advertissement au lecteur; pp.47-94, Anti-Cotton; pp.95-6, Table des chapitres ... de l'Anti-Cotton; pp.97-102, Remonstrance de l'Université de Paris; p.103, h.-t.; pp.105-6, Epistre dedicatoire; pp.107-66, L'Assassinat du Roy, ou Maximes du vieil de la Montagne Vaticane; pp.167-8, Advis au Lecteur; p.169, Table des chapitres; p.170, Avertissement.

Copies: B.N.: La²²5; La²²6; Sorb.: Rr.163(vii).

Notes: According to Barbier this edition was edited by Prosper Marchand (Dict. des anonymes, iii, 194). See no. 41.02 above for separate issue of the 'Quatrième partie', and for evidence that this edition was, in fact, published in the Hague; such an origin would be borne out by the typographical features of the work.

42.01 JOURNAL/ DE/ HENRI III./ Roy de France & de Pologne:/ OU/ MEMOIRES/

 POUR SERVIR/ A/ L'HISTOIRE DE FRANCE,/ Par M. PIERRE DE L'ESTOILE./

 NOUVELLE EDITION:/ Accompagnée de Remarques Historiques, & des Pieces/

manuscrites les plus curieuses de ce Regne./ TOME I. [TOME II./ TOME
 III./ TOME IV./ TOME V.]/ [Typ. orn.]/ A LA HAYE,/ Et se trouve/ A

 PARIS,/ Chez la Veuve de PIERRE GANDOUIN,/ Quay [Ts.II-V: Quai]

 des Augustins, à la Belle Image./ [rule 50mm.]/ M. DCC. XLIV./

Variant imprint:

[...]/ A LA HAYE,/ Chez PIERRE GOSSE./ [rule 50mm.]/ M. DCC. XLIV./

8° (166x99mm): T.I. π^1 a-b⁸ c⁴ A-D⁸ E⁸ (\pm E1,8) F⁸ (\pm F6) G-H⁸ I⁸ (\pm I7)
 K⁸ (\pm K2) L⁸ (\pm L1,4) M-P⁸ Q⁸ (\pm Q6) R-T⁸ V⁸ (\pm V8) X-Y⁸ Z⁸ (\pm Z1,5,7) 2A-C⁸
 2D⁸ (\pm 2D4) 2E-G⁸ 2H⁸ (\pm 2H3) 2I-Q⁸. Pp. [4], i-x1, 1-624.

T.II. π^1 a⁸ A⁸ B⁸ (\pm B1,7) C⁸ D⁸ (\pm D3,6,7) E⁸ F⁸ (\pm F7) G⁸ (\pm G5) H⁸ (\pm H4)
 I⁸ (\pm I3) K⁸ L⁸ (\pm L5) M-Q⁸ R⁸ (\pm R7) S-T⁸ V⁸ (\pm V7) X⁸ (\pm X2) Y⁸ (\pm Y4) Z⁸ (\pm Z3)
 2A⁸ (\pm 2A7) 2B⁸ (\pm 2B3,4) 2C⁸ (\pm 2C5) 2D-O⁸. Pp. [2], i-xvi, 1-591.

T.III. π^1 a⁶ A-2R⁸ 2S¹ X¹. Pp. [2], i-xii, 1-642, [2].

T.IV. π^1 a-b⁸ c² A-2O⁸ 2P⁴. Pp. [2], i-xxxvi, 1-600.

T.V. π^1 a² A-2Q⁸ 2R⁶. Pp. [2], i-iv, 1-636.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-4. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: T.I. T.-p.; pp.i-xv, Preface du nouvel editeur; pp.xvi-xx, Avis au lecteur [tiré de l'édition de Godefroy, 1719]; pp.xxi-iv, Avertissement sur la nouvelle impression de ce livre faite à Cologne... en 1720; pp.xxv-xxxiii, Notes posthumes de M. Le Duchat; pp.xxxiv-viii, Corrections et Observations; pp.xxxix-xl, Table des Pièces; pp.1-501, Journal...; pp.502-8, Lettre du roy François I. à madame sa mère...; pp.509-13, Instruction du roy Charles IX, envoyée

en Allemagne au sujet de la Saint-Barthelemy; pp.514-48, Lettre [s] du Roy au Sieur de Schomberg; pp.549-98, La Tragédie de feu Gaspar de Colligni; pp.599-624, Table des matieres.

T.II. T.-p.; pp.i-xiii, Table des Pieces; pp.xv-xvi, Differences remarquées dans le Procès Verbal de Nicolas Poullain; pp.1-214, Journal...; pp.214-9, Certificat de plusieurs seigneurs...; pp.220-7, Lettre d'un des premiers officiers de la cour de parlement...sur le sujet de la mort du roy; pp.228-67, Le Procez verbal du nommé Nicolas Poulain; pp.268-98, Discours sur la vie du roy Henri III, par M. Le Laboureur; pp.299-458, Discours merveilleux de la vie, actions et déportemens de la reine Catherine de Medicis; pp.459-551, Journal des choses advenues à Paris depuis le 23 décembre 1588...; pp.552-69, Abregé de l'histoire de Henri III...., par Machon; pp.571-91, Table des matieres.

T.III. T.-p.; pp.i-xii, Table des pieces; pp.1-628, Preuves du Journal de Henri III; pp.629-42, Table des matieres; Avis.

T.IV. T.-p.; pp.i-xxx, Avis au lecteur sur les Pieces; pp.xxxi-vi, Table des traités et articles; pp.1-336, Description de l'isle des Hermaphrodites...; pp.337-432, Histoire des amours du grand Alcandre; pp.433-67, Lettres du roy Henri IV; pp.468-85, Apologie pour le roy Henri IV..., par madame la Duchesse de Rohan; pp.486-520, Divorce satyrique, ou les Amours de la reine Marguerite; pp.521-7, Privilèges...de la ville capitale de Boisbelle; p.528, Avertissement; pp.529-62, Recueil de quelques actions et paroles memorables de Henri le Grand; pp.563-89, Différences remarquées entre l'imprimé de la Confession de Sancy...et le manuscrit...; pp.591-600, Table des matieres.

T.V. T.-p.; pp.i-iv, Table des chapitres; pp.1-608, La Confession de Sancy; pp.609-36, Table des matieres.

Copies: B.N.: 8°Lb³⁴ 1.E; B.N.: Coll. Rothschild, 2188bis(I.2.1-5);
B.L.: 244.b.17-24.

Notes: There is a frontispiece in T.I, 3 full-page engraved illustrations in T.II, and 1 in T.III.

On the date of publication of the edition, and the censor's corrections which necessitated the printing of the cancellantia noted above, see Chapter V, pp.316 ff. The cancellanda are in fact present in a number of the copies I have seen; the Rothschild copy contains all the original pages, with the cancellantia bound at the back of the relevant volumes. The variant title-page may, in fact, have been printed for these 'illegal' copies, which breached the terms of the permission tacite accorded to Rollin for the censored version (see Chapter V, p.317, where Secousse mentions this permission).

- 42.02 La Guisiade, tragedie nouvelle, par Pierre Matthieu (in 42.01, T.III, pp.515-624): 'Pièce [...] très-rare & recherchée des Amateurs. C'est à ce titre que l'Abbé Lenglet l'a publiée de nouveau, avec des Notes [...] 1744.in-8°. L'Imprimeur détacha quelques exemplaires de la Guisiade pour être vendus séparément.' (Michault, Mémoires, pp.182-3).
I have not located any copies of this separate issue.

- 42.03 La Tragédie de feu Gaspar de Colligni, par François de Chantelouve, (in 42.01, T.I, pp.549-98): 'On en tira séparément quelques exemplaires pour la satisfaction particuliere des Curieux qui ont dessein de faire une suite complete de nos Pièces Dramatiques.' (Michault, Mémoires, p.183). Hébrail and La Porte record a copy of this work, '1744, in-8°' (La France littéraire, iii, 69).

- 42.04 'Massacre de la Saint-Barthélémi. Exposé du fait d'après Lenglet du Fresnoy', in Collection des meilleurs dissertations, notices et traités particuliers relatifs à l'histoire de France, Paris, Dentu, 1826-38, xviii, 19-25.

- 43.01 [Double rule 70mm.] / LETTRES, / NEGOTIATIONS / ET / PIECES SECRETES, /
[rule 69mm.] / Pour servir à l'Histoire des Provinces- / Unies & de

la Guerre présente,/ & de suite, ou de confirmation aux/ Lettres de
S.E.M. Van-Hoey,/ Ambassadeur de L.H.P. à la Cour de France./[rule
68mm.]/ A LONDRES,/ Chez JOHN NOURSE, à l'Agneau, près/ du Temple
Bar./[rule 68mm.]/ MD. CC. XLIV./[rule 66mm.]/

12°(162x92mm.): π^1 a⁶ N¹ A-M¹² [D6 signed 'Evi']. Pp. [2], i-xiv,
1-287 (misprinting xiii and xiv as '289' and '290').

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: T.-p.; pp.i-iii, Avis de l'imprimeur; pp.iv-xi, Avertisse-
ment; pp.xii-xiv, Table des pieces; pp.1-67, Trois lettres qui peuvent
servir à la connoissance de l'Etat présent de l'Europe; pp.68-259,
[Les Pièces...]; pp.259-70, Lettre sur le Discours de S.E.M. le
Marquis de Fenelon; pp.271-87, Discours de son Excellence M. le
Marquis de Fenelon.

Copies: B.N.: Lg⁴34; Ste.Gen.: Q.8°434.Inv.1424 (Pièce 2).

Notes: The typographical features indicate that this work was pub-
lished in France, probably in Paris.

44.01 L'EUROPE/ PACIFIÉE/ PAR L'EQUITÉ/ DE LA/ REINE DE HONGRIE,/ OU/
DISTRIBUTION LEGALE/ DE LA SUCCESSION D'AUTRICHE./[double rule 67mm.]/
Par M. ALBERT VAN-HEUSSEN, Seigneur/ de Zeverghem & d'Ottersem,/
Conseiller,/ Pensionnaire de la Ville de Gand./[Typ.orn.]/ A
BRUXELLES,/ Chez FRANCOIS FOPPENS, Libraire./[double rule 48mm.]/
M. DCC. XLV./

12°(168x95mm.): π^2 A-G¹² H⁶. Pp. [4], 1-180.

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. Catchwords on every page.

Contents: T.-p.; Au lecteur; pp.1-35, A Très-Auguste et Très-Puissante Princesse la Reine de Hongrie; pp.36-9, Ordonnance du Roy Portant déclaration de guerre...; pp.40-8, Exposé des motifs, qui ont obligé le Roy de donner des Troupes auxiliaires a l'Empereur; pp.49-174, L'Europe pacifiée...; pp.175-80, Memoire sur le General Seckendorff.

Copies: B.N.: M.15025; Ars.: 8°H.3603.

Notes: This work was probably printed in Paris: the catchwords may have been deliberately used on every page, contrary to French practice, in order to give the book a foreign appearance. Cf. no. 45.01 below.

45.01 LETTRES/ D'UN PAIR/ DE LA GRANDE BRETAGNE.[swash T]/ A MILORD,/ ARCHEVEQUE DE CANTORBERI./ Sur l'état présent des Affaires de l'Europe.[triple rule 63mm.]/ TRADUITES DE L'ANGLAIS/ Par le Chevalier EDWARD MELTON,/ membre de la Société Royale de/ Londres & de celle de Berlin./[double rule 61mm.]/ [Typ.orn.]/ A LONDRES,/ Chez INNYS près l'Eglise S. Paul./[rule 32mm.]/ M. DC. XLV/

8°(161x100mm.): A-G⁸ H⁴. Pp.1-119.

Production: Signs. roman 1-4. Quire catchwords.

Contents: T.-p.; pp.3-6, Avertissement du Traducteur; pp.7-78, Lettres d'un Pair...; pp.79-84, Discours prononcé devant le Roy, dans sa Tente, à Pont-à-Chin, sous Tournay, le 4. de Juin 1745;

pp.85-8, Lettre du Roy a M. l'Archevêque de Paris; pp.89-119, Relation exacte et détaillée...contenant ce qui s'est passé à la Bataille de Fontenoy, gagnée par l'Armée du Roi, commandée par Sa Majesté, le 11. May 1745.

Copies: B.N.: G.17210; Nc.2963.

Notes: The type-face and typ.orns. used in this volume suggest that it was printed in the same workshop as no.44.01.

- 46.01 RECUEIL/ DE ROMANS/ HISTORIQUES./ TOME PREMIER./ [Device: 2 cherubs embracing, one holding a torch, signed 'De Seve In. & fessard. Sculp.'; 40x57mm.] / A LONDRES./ [double rule] / M. DCC. XLVI./
T.II.
- [...]/ TOME SECOND./ [Device: 2 cherubs, one pointing to a picture of a heart, sign. as in T.I; 38x44mm.] / [...]
T.III.
- [...]/ TOME TROISIE'ME./ [Device: 2 cherubs looking into a hand-mirror, sign. as in T.I; 41x55mm.] / [...]
T.IV.
- [...]/ TOME QUATRIE'ME./ [Device: 2 cherubs playing with a garland of flowers, sign. as in T.I; 42x55mm.] / [...]
T.V.
- [...]/ TOME CINQUIE'ME./ [Device as in T.III] / [...] / M. DCC. XLVII./
T.VI.
- [...]/ TOME SIXIE'ME./ [Device as in T.II] / [...as for T.V.]
T.VII.
- [...]/ TOME SEPTIE'ME./ [Device as in T.IV] / [...as for T.V.]
T.VIII.
- [...]/ TOME HUITIE'ME./ [Device as in T.I] / [... as for T.V.]

Variant imprint:Ts.I-IV: [...] / M. DCC. XLVII. /12° (143x79mm.): T.I. $\pi^2 a^4 A-2C^{8-4} 2D^8$. Pp. [4], i-viii, 1-326.T.II. $\pi^2 a^2 A-V^{8-4} X^7$. Pp. [4], i-iv, 1-254.T.III. $\pi^2 a^2 A-Y^{8-4} Z^2$. Pp. [4], i-iv, 1-268.T.IV. $\pi^2 a^2 A-2E^{8-4} 2F^2$ [2E2 signed 'Eeiii'.] Pp. [4], i-iv, 1-339
(misprinting lll as 'lll5').T.V. $\pi^2 a^2 A-V^{8-4} X^8$. Pp. [4], i-v, 1-256 (misprinting iv as 'v').T.VI. $\pi^2 a^2 A-2A^{8-4} 2B^1$. Pp. [4], i-iv, 1-290.T.VII. $\pi^2 a^2 A-Z^{8-4} 2A^4$. Pp. [4], i-iv, 1-288.T.VIII. $\pi^2 a^2 A-Y^{8-4} Z^6$. Pp. [4], i-iv, 1-275.Production: Signs. roman 1-4, 1-2. Quire catchwords.Contents: H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-viii, Préface; pp.1-127, Le connétable de Bourbon; pp.128-206, La Comtesse de Monfort; pp.207-326, La Princesse de Portien.

T.II. H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-iii, Avertissement; p.iv, Avis du Libraire; pp.1-120, Le comte d'Amboise; pp.121-254, Histoire de Henri IV, roi de Castille, surnommé l'Impuissant.

T.III. H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-iv, Avertissement; pp.1-114, Le Comte de Dunois; pp.115-89, Memoires du comte de Comminge; pp.190-268, Histoire d'Amenophis, prince de Libye.

T.IV. H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-iv, Avertissement; pp.1-110, Le duc de Guise; pp.111-339, Marie d'Anjou, reine de Mayorque.

T.V. H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-iv, Avertissement; pp.1-256, Alix de France.

T.VI. H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-iv, Préface; pp.1-197, La princesse de

Montferrat; pp.198-290, Raimond, comte de Barcelone.

T.VII. H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-iv, Préface; pp.1-288, Histoire secrète de Bourgogne.

T.VIII. H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-iv, Préface; pp.1-122, Federic de Sicile; pp.123-92, Merouée, fils de France; pp.193-275, Adelaïs de Bourgogne.

Copies: B.N.: Y².61709-16; B.L.: 244.b.17-24; Tay.Ox.: Vet.Fr.II. B.1191-4 (incomplete).

47.01 MEMOIRES/ DE MESSIRE/ PHILIPPE DE COMINES,/ SEIGNEUR D'ARGENTON,/ Où l'on trouve l'Histoire des Rois de France/ LOUIS XI. & CHARLES VIII./ NOUVELLE EDITION./ Revûe sur plusieurs Manuscrits du tems, enrichie de Notes/ & de Figures, avec un Recueil de Traités, Lettres,/ Contrats & Instructions, utiles pour l'Histoire, & néces-/ saires pour l'étude du Droit Public & du Droit des Gens./ Par Messieurs GODEFROY./ Augmentée par M. l'Abbé LENGLET DU FRESNOY./ TOME PREMIER. [TOME II./ TOME III./ TOME IV.]/ [Typ.orn.]/ A LONDRES,/ Et se trouve/ A PARIS,/ Chez ROLLIN, Fils, Quai des Augustins./ [double rule]/ M. DCC. XLVII./

4° (260x216mm.): T.I. π^3 a-o⁴ p³ A-4K⁴ [4I2 signed⁴Iiii⁷] Pp. [6], i-cxviii, 1-632.

T.II. π^1 a⁴ e² A-4N⁴ 40². Pp. [4], i-x, 1-660.

T.III. π^2 a-b⁴ c² A-4M⁴ 4N². Pp. [4], i-xx, 1-650.

T.IV. π^2 a⁴ A-3H⁴ 2A-2D⁴. Pp. [4], i-viii, 1-432, 1-215.

Production: T.I:Signs. roman 1-3. Quire catchwords. T.II-IV: Signs. arabic 1-3. Catchwords on every page. Type-face in T.I differs from

other vols.: printer's imprint on last page reads 'De l'imprimerie de C.F. Simon, Fils, Imprimeur de la Reine & de Monseigneur l'Archevesque. 1747.'

Contents: H.-t.; t.-p.; Homage...[au] Marechal comte de Saxe; pp.i-xcvi, Preface; pp.xcix-cii, Avertissement de M. Godefroy; pp.ciii-cxviii, Table des sommaires et des chapitres; pp.1-599, Memoires de Philippe de Comines; pp.601-32, Table des matieres.

T.II. H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-x, Table des pieces, actes et titres; pp.1-172, Les Chroniques de Louys de Valois, Roy de France; pp.173-221, Extrait d'une ancienne chronique, commençant en 1400; pp.222-62, Le Cabinet du Roy Louis XI.; pp.263-84, Eloge du Roy Charles VIII. par M. de Brantome; pp.284-302, Comparaison du regne du Roy Louys XII. à celui du Roy Louys XI.; pp.303-644, Preuves des Memoires de Philippes de Comines; pp.645-60, Table des matieres.

T.III. H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-xix, Table des pieces, actes et titres; p.xx, Accord fait entre M. le Curé de S. Paul...; pp.1-632, Preuves des Memoires de Philippes de Comines; pp.633-50, Table des matieres.

T.IV. H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-viii, Table des pieces, actes et titres; pp.1-432, 1-121, Preuves des Memoires de Philippes de Comines; pp.122-3, La Vie de Philippes de Comines; pp.124-54, Quelques annotations et remarques particulieres sur la vie de Philippes de Comines; pp.155-78, Eloges et temoignages en faveur de Philippes de Comines; pp.179-93, Table des matieres; pp.194-215, Seconde Table ou Table generale des noms propres de personnes.

Copies: B.N.: Rés.4°La¹⁶10E; B.L.: 1197.k.9-12; T.C.D.:

Fag.r.9.37-40.

Notes: A suite of 55 engraved portraits, depicting famous personages under the reigns of Louis XI and Charles VII, was produced by 'Odieuvre, Md. d'Estampes rue Danjou Dauphine' to accompany the edition. There is a wide variation in the number of portraits present in each copy: presumably the purchase of the entire series would have represented a considerable expense. In addition there was a frontispiece, a portrait of Lenglet himself which I have found in only a small number of copies, and a portrait of Maurice de Saxe which was suppressed along with the Dedication (see Chapter V, pp.323-4).

The Dedication was, in fact, issued in two separate states: one in black and red, one in black only. It was presumably in high demand, together with the accompanying portrait, precisely because of the suppression, and the publisher may have decided to print a second run on that account.

The edition was originally advertised for subscription at 40 livres for large-paper copies, and 30 livres for the normal size, to be sold subsequently for 50 and 40 livres respectively (see Le Journal des savants, Dec.1745, p.751). The portraits would presumably be paid for separately.

A large-paper copy, containing the portraits and the Dedication, was sold with the La Vallière collection for 286 francs before the end of the century (see Brunet, Manuel du libraire, ii, 191).

The first 2 vols. were apparently printed before the end of 1745 (see the Journal des savants, Dec. 1745, p.751), but the edition was not published until mid-1747 (see Journal des savants, June 1747, p.379).

47.02 COLLECTION/ UNIVERSELLE/ DES/ MÉMOIRES PARTICULIERS/ RELATIFS/ A
L'HISTOIRE DE FRANCE./ TOME X. [TOME XI./ TOME XII.]/ A LONDRES;/
Et se trouve à PARIS,/ Rue d'ANJOU-DAUPHINE, N°.6./ 1785./

8° (192x121mm.): T.X. a⁸ A-2G⁸ 2H⁷. Pp.i-xvi, 1-494.

T.XI.π² A-2M⁸. Pp.[4], 1-560.

T.XII.π² A-2I⁸ 2K⁷. Pp.[4], 1-526.

Production: Signs. arabic 1-4. Quire catchwords.

Contents: The text of the Mémoires de Comines is as for no.47.01, together with Lenglet's Preface and notes; most of the additional

material has, however, been omitted or abridged. The new editors have added to the notes, and have introduced divisions and headings in the text.

Copies: T.C.D.: Gall.Z.5.108.

48.01 LUCII CAECILII/ FIRMIANI LACTANTII/ OPERA OMNIA:/ EDITIO NOVISSIMA,/
 QUAE OMNIUM INSTAR ESSE POTEST: AD LXXX./ & amplius MSS. codices,
 editosque XL. collata &/ emendata, atque Notis uberioribus illustrata;/
 CUI MANUM PRIMAM/ Adhibuit JOANNES-BAPTISTA LE BRUN, Rothomagensis;/
 EXTREMAM/ Imposuit NICOLAUS LENGLET DUFRESNOY, Presbyter/ ac Theologus
 Parisiensis./ TOMUS PRIMUS.[TOMUS SECUNDUS.]/ [Device: coat of arms;
 61x75mm.]/ LUTETIAE PARISIORUM,/ Apud JOANNEM DE BURE, Bibliopolam,
 ad Ripam Augustiniensium./ [double rule 62mm.]/ M. DCC. XLVIII./
CUM APPROBATIONE ET PRIVILEGIO REGIS. [swash T twice]/

4°(255x190mm.): π^2 a-t⁴ A-C⁴ D⁴(±D2) E-P⁴ Q⁴(±Q1) R-2E⁴ 2F⁴(±2F3,4)
 2G-N⁴ 20⁴(±204) 2P-3L⁴ 3M⁴(±3M2,4) 3N-5B⁴. Pp.[4], i-clii, 1-750, [2].
 T.II. π^2 a-k⁴ l¹ A-B⁴ C⁴(±C1) D-K⁴ L⁴(±L2) M-2A⁴ 2B⁴(±2B4) 2C⁴
 2D⁴(±2D1) 2E⁴ 2F⁴(±2F4) 2G⁴ 2H⁴(±2H3,4) 2I⁴(±2I1,2) 2K-5L⁴ 5M².
 Pp.[4], i-lxxxii, 1-827.

Production: Signs. roman 1-3. Quire catchwords.

Contents: H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-ii, [Dedication:] Armando Gastoni S.R.E.
 Cardinali de Rohan; pp.iii-xix, Praefatio in Lactantium; pp.xx-xxi,
 Lactantii vita; pp.xxii-vi, Insignium virorum Testimonia de L.
 Caecilio Firmiano Lactantio; pp.xxvii-xxxii, Elenchus manuscrip-

torum codicum Lactantii; p.xxxii, Admonitio in sequentem notitiam; pp.xxxiii-vi, Notitia manuscriptorum codicum Lucii Cæcilii Firmiani Lactantii qui asservantur Romæ, in Apostolicâ Bibliothecâ Vaticana; pp.xxxvii-xli, Variæ editiones Lactantii; pp.xlii-cxxiii, Notæ posteriores, excerptæ ex editione Lactantii vulgata anno M. DCC.

XXXIX. A.V.C. Jo. Ludolpho Bunemanno...; pp.cxxiv-vii, Variæ lectiones editionis sublacensis anni 1465; pp.cxxviii-xxxii, Index locorum Sacræ Scripturæ; pp.cxxxiii-vii, Synthesis doctrinæ Lactantii; pp.cxxxviii-xl, Annotationes censoriæ in quædam Lactantii errata; pp.cxli-iii, Propositiones, quæ in Lactantio reperiuntur ad fidem pertinentes; pp.cxliv-cl, Summaria capitum...; pp.cli-ii, Analysis libri primi Lactantii argumentum; pp.1-592, Lucii Cæcilii Firmiani Lactantii Divinarum Institutionum; pp.593-722, Josephi Isæi Cæsenatis notæ...; pp.723-50, Index rerum verborumque...; sign. 5B3, Errata; sign.5B4, Judicium...Privilege du Roy.

T.II. H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-iv, In secundum volumen Præfatio; pp.v-xlvi, Notæ posteriores...; pp.xlviii-lx, Disquisitio, de auctore libri...De Mortibus persecutorum...; pp.lxi-iii, Appendix de duobus locis codicis manuscripti libri De Mortibus persecutorum...; pp.lxiv-viii, Henrici Dodwelli Dissertatio de Ripa Striga; pp.lxix-xxviii, Henrici Dodwelli Chronologia Persecutionum, item Stephani Baluzii Chronologia Diocletiana; pp.lxxix-xxxii, Summaria capitum librorum Lactantii...; pp.1-69, Epitome[s] Institutionum Divinarum; p.70, Admonitio...; pp.71-125, De Opificio Dei; pp.125-6, Analysis...; pp.127-79, De Ira Dei; pp.180-250, Liber ad Donatum Confessorem, de Mortibus Persecutorum; pp.251-63, Symposium; pp.263-9, Incerti auctoris Phœnix; pp.270-3, Venantii Honorii Clementiani Fortunati;

pp.273-4, Incerti auctoris carmen, De Passione Domini; pp.275-760, Notâe...; pp.761-90, Index auctorum librorumque...; pp.791-820, Index rerum verborumque notabilium...; p.820, Errata; pp.821-5, Emendanda in notis Pauli Baudri; p.826, Sacrae Scripturae testimonia quaedam...citantur a Lactantio; p.827, Avis au relieur pour placer les Cartons.

Copies: B.N.:Rés.C.1620; Maz.:12070 A-B; B.L.: 697.i.23.

Notes: There are 5 plates in T.II.

The work was advertised at a price of 30 livres (Mémoires de Trévoux, June 1748, p.1335); there were a number of large-paper copies, which presumably sold for a higher price.

The edition was published late in the year 1748 (see Chapter V, note 281).

48.02 [Patrologiâe cursus completus...series prima, TomusVI-VII, ed.

J.P. MIGNE:]

LUCII CAECILII FIRMIANI/ LACTANTII/ OPERA OMNIA,/ AD PRÆSTANTISSIMAM
 LENGLETII-DUFRESNOY EDITIONEM EXPRESSA;/ BUNEMANNI, O.F. FRITZCHE,
 N. LE NOURRY CUM EMENDATIONIBUS TUM/ DISQUISITIONIBUS CRITICIS AUCTA:/
 EDITIO NOVISSIMA,/ QUÆ OMNIUM INSTAR ESSE POTEST, AD OCTOGINTA ET
 AMPLIUS MSS. CODICES EDITOSQUE/ QUADRAGINTA COLLATA NOTISQUE
 UBERIORIBUS ILLUSTRATA./ PRÆCEDUNT/ S. MARCELLINI PAPAE,
 S. MARCELLI PAPAE, S. EUSEBII PAPAE, S. MELCHIADES PAPAE,/ ANONYMI,
 CELSI, OMNIA QUÆ EXSTANT/ FRAGMENTA./ [ornamental rule 30mm.]/
 HORUM TOMUS UNICUS,/ LACTANTII TOMUS PRIMUS. [LACTANTII TOMUS SECUNDUS
 ET ULTIMUS.]/ [ornamental rule 30mm.]/ PARISIIS/ EXCUDERAT SIROU,/ IN VIA DICTA D'AMBOISE, PRÈS LA BARRIÈRE D'ENFER,/ OU PETIT-
 MONTROUGE./ [rule 3 mm.]/ 1844./

T.I. Pp.[2], columns 7-1100 [=275 leaves].

T.II. Pp.[2], columns 8-1203 [=300 leaves].

Contents: Based closely on the text, notes and introductions of no. 48.01.

Copies: B.L.:2000.a.

49.01 RELATION/ DE LA/ CONSPIRATION/ TRAMÉE/ PAR LE BACHA DE RHODES,/ CONTRE/ L'ISLE DE MALTHE./ [Device: cul-de-lampe, with initials 'V.P'; 46x67mm.]/ A PARIS,/ De l'Imprimerie de JOSEPH BULLOT, ruë S. Etienne d'Egrès./ [double rule 60mm.]/ M DCC XLIX./ AVEC APPROBATION ET PERMISSION. [swash T twice]./

4° (245x185mm) 4A-B⁴. Pp.1-15.

Production: Signs. roman 1-2. Quire catchwords.

Contents: P.1, t.-p.; p.2, Avertissement; pp.3-15, Relation de la conspiration.

Copies: B.N.: Hp 317; K4843; Biblioteca Angelica (Rome): c.628 XXV.

Notes: See Chapter V, pp.352-3, on the circumstances relating to the publication of this pamphlet.

50.01 MÉMOIRES/ DE/ LA RÉGENCE./ Nouvelle Edition, considerable-/ ment augmentée./ TOME PREMIER. [TOME SECOND. (swash T)]/ TOME TROISIEME./ TOME QUATRIEME./ TOME CINQUIEME.] [Typ.orn.]/ A AMSTERDAM,/ [double

rule 53mm.]/ M. DCC. XLIX./

12° (135x80mm.): $\pi^2 \star^{12} \chi^4 A^{12} (\pm A1) B-O^{12}$. Pp. [36], 1-336.

T.II. $\pi^1 A-M^{12}$ [K5,6 signed 'Kvi,vii']. Pp. [2], 1-288.

T.III. $\pi^1 A-M^{12} N^6 O^2$. Pp. [2], 1-303.

T.IV. $\pi^1 A-M^{12} N^6 O^3$. Pp. [2], 1-306.

T.V. $\pi^1 A-G^{12}, {}^2G^{12} (\pm G11), H-K^{12} L^5$. Pp. [2], 1-273.

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: T.I. H.-t.; t.-p.; [4pp.], Avis de l'imprimeur; [28pp.],
Préface; pp.1-144, Memoires de la regence; pp.145-336, [Pieces], N° I-
N° VI.

T.II. T.-p.; pp.1-216, Memoires...; pp.217-30, Memoire sur le Gouverne-
ment, présenté à Monsieur le Duc d'Orléans, Par M. le Comte de Boull-
ainvilliers; pp.231-88, Reflexions et considerations sur le Mémoire
des formalités nécessaires pour valider la Rénonciation du Roi
d'Espagne.

T.III. T.-p.; pp.1-303, Mémoires....

T.IV. T.-p.; pp.1-306, Mémoires....

T.V. T.-p.; pp.1-166, Mémoires...; p.167, h.-t.; pp.169-209,
Reflexions sur la conspiration projetée par le prince de Cellamare;
pp.210-73, Histoire abregée du systeme des finances.

Copies: B.N.: 8° Lb³⁸ 2; Ars.: 8° H.8544¹⁻⁵; B.L.: 283.a.37-41.

Notes: There are 8 engraved portraits in T.I, 3 in T.III, 1 in
T.IV, and also 2 fold-out illustrations in T.IV, 2 in T.V.

The typographical features strongly suggest that this work was
printed in France.

51.01 CALENDRIER/ HISTORIQUE/ POUR L'ANNE'E/ M. DCC. L./ AVEC/ L'Origine
de toutes les Mai-/ sons Souveraines,/ TIRE'E/ Du nouvel Abrégé
Chrono-/ logique de l'Histoire/ de l'Europe./ [Typ.orn.] / A PARIS/
Chez JEAN-NOEL LELOUP,/ à l'entrée du quai des Augustins,/ à S.
Chrysostome./ [double rule 39mm.] / Avec Approbation & Privilege du
Roy./

24° (102x52mm.): A-F⁸ [gathered as one quire]. Pp. [28], 1-64, [4].

Production: Signs. roman 1-4. Catchwords on 4th leaf of each signature.

Contents: T.-p.; sign. A1, Avis du libraire; sign. A2, Remarques sur le Calendrier; sign. A2-D2, Calendrier; pp. 1-64, Extrait de l'Abrege chronologique de l'histoire de l'Europe; pp. 64-8, Approbation[§]...Privilege du Roi.

Copies: B.N.: G.20634.

52.01 CALENDRIER/ DES/ PRINCES/ ET DE/ LA NOBLESSE,/ POUR/ L'ANNEE 1750./
[Typ.orn.] / A PARIS,/ Chez DELAGUETTE, Imprimeur-/ Libraire, rue
Saint-Jacques,/ à l'Olivier./ [double rule 45mm.] / M. DCC. L./ Avec
Approbation & Privilege du Roy./

24° (120x60mm.): $\pi^8 A^4 B-E^{12} \chi^1$ [C9 signed 'C'; D3 signed 'D4', D4 signed 'D3']. Pp. [16], 1-103, [3].

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: T.-p.; [2pp.], Avis de l'Imprimeur; [12pp.], [Calendrier];

pp.1-52, Liste chronologique et genealogique des Rois de France;
 pp.53-103, Liste alphabetique des maisons du royaume, honorées par
 les charges de la Couronne; [2pp.], Approbation...privilège.

Copies: Maz.: 33567N; Ars.:8°H.22542.

53.01 COURS/ DE/ CHYMIE,/ POUR/ SERVIR D'INTRODUCTION/ à cette Science./

 PAR NICOLAS LE FEVRE, Professeur/ Royal de Chymie, [Ts.II-V:

 'en Chymie'] & Membre de la/ Société Royale de Londres./ CINQUIEME

 EDITION,/ Revûe, corrigée & augmentée d'un grand nombre/ d'Opérations,

& enrichie de Figures./ PAR M. DU MONSTIER, Apoticaire de la Marine/
 & des Vaisseaux du Roi; Membre de la Société/ Royale de Londres & de
 celle de Berlin./ TOME PREMIER. [TOME SECOND./ TOME TROISIEME./ TOME

 QUATRIEME./ TOME CINQUIEME.]/ [Typ.orn.]/ A PARIS,/ Chez JEAN-NOEL
 LELOUP, Quay des/ Augustins, à la descente du Pont Saint/ Michel,
 à Saint Jean Chrysostome./ [double rule 44mm.]/ M. DCC. LI./

Variant imprint:

/ A PARIS,/ Chez ROLLIN, Fils, Quay des Augustins,/ à

 Saint Athanaſe./ [double rule 44mm.]/ M. DCC. LI./ Avec Approbation
& Privilège du Roi./

12°(165x94mm.): π^2 a¹² b⁸ A-S¹² T¹¹. Pp.[4], i-xxxvi, [4], 1-454.

T.II. π^2 a⁴ b¹ A-T¹² V⁸. Pp.[4], i-x, 1-472.

T.III. π^2 a⁷ A-T¹² V¹¹. Pp.[4], i-xiv, 1-477.

T.IV. π^1 a⁷ A-V¹² X². Pp.[2], i-xiv, 1-484 (misprinting 481-4 as
 '433-6').

T.V. π^1 a⁹ b¹ A-S¹² T². Pp.[2], i-xx, 1-436.

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-xx, Preface de l'editeur; pp.xxi-ii, Avis de Nicolas Le Fevre; pp.xxiii-vi, Preface de la troisième Edition de Christophe Glaser; p.xxvi, Approbation[s]; pp.xxvii-xxxvi, Table des Chapitres; sign.b7-b8, Approbation...Privilege; pp.1-412, Traité de Chymie, en forme d'abregé [de le Févre]; pp.412-32, Addition au Tome premier; pp.433-54, Table des Matieres.

T.II. H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-x, Table des Chapitres; pp.1-414, Traité de Chymie; pp.414-56, Additions pour le Tome Second; pp.457-72, Table des matieres.

T.III. H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-xiv, Table des Chapitres; pp.1-428, Traité de Chymie; pp.429-56, Additions pour le Tome Troisieme; pp.457-77, Table alphabetique.

T.IV. H.-t.; p.i, t.-p.; pp.iii-xiv, Table des chapitres et articles; pp.1-336, Additions au traité de chymie; pp.337-456, Nouvelles additions; pp.457- 84, Table des matieres.

T.V. H.-t.; p.i, t.-p.; pp.iii-xx, Table des chapitres; pp.1-295, [Additions au] traité de Chymie; pp.296-408, Différences qui se rencontrent entre les Chymies de le Fevre & de Glaser; pp.409-36, Table des matières.

Copies: B.N.: R.41326-30; Ars.: 8°S.12 338¹⁻⁵.

Notes: There are 5 fold-out engraved illustrations in T.I, 1 in T.II, 2 in T.III, and 2 in T.V.

The Privilège was acquired by De Bure in Jan. 1749, and transferred to Leloup in July of the same year. Presumably Rollin bought part of the edition from Leloup.

54.01 METALLURGIE,/ OU/ L'ART DE TIRER ET DE PURIFIER/ LES MÉTAUX,/

Traduite de l'Espagnol d'Alphonse BARBA/ AVEC/ Les Dissertations

les plus rares sur les Mines/ & les Opérations Métalliques./

DE'DIE'E/ A M. GRASSIN, Directeur Général/ des Monnoyes de France./

TOME PREMIER. [TOME SECOND]/ [Device: cul-de-lampe, 18x22mm.]/

A PARIS, / Chez PIERRE-ALEXANDRE LE PRIEUR ,/ Imp. ord. du Roi, rue

S. Jacques, / à la Croix d'Or. / [double rule 54mm.] / M. DCC. LI. /

Avec Approbation & Privilege du Roy. /

12° (164x92mm.): a-b¹² c⁴ A-Q¹² R¹² (-R6+X⁵) S-T¹² V⁸. Pp.i-xliv,

[12], 1-396, 387-96, 397-456, [16].

T.II. a⁶ A-V¹⁰. Pp. [12], 1-456, [20].

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: P.i, h.-t.; p.iii, t.-p.; pp.v-xii, A Monsieur Grassin...; pp.xiii-xliv, Préface; sign.b11-c4, Table des chapitres; pp.1-393, Traité de metallurgie ou connoissance théorique et pratique des mines; p.396, h.-t.: 'Additions au traité...'; pp.387-91, Liste des mines du Perou; pp.392-406, Extraits de Bernardo de Vargas; pp.407-56, Description abregée des anciennes mines d'Espagne, par Don Alonso Carrillo Laso; sign.V1-V8, Table des matieres.

T.II. T.-p.; sign. a2-a6, Table des Dissertations et Traités; p.1, h.-t.; pp.3-38, Avis des riches mines d'Or et d'Argent...par le Sieur de Malus; pp.39-55, Veritable declaration faite au Roy...par la Barone de Beausoleil; pp.56-151, La Restitution de Pluton; pp.153-262, Paradoxe que les metaux ont vie. Composé par Guillaume Granger; pp.263-416, Dissertations choisies, tirées des différens Auteurs qui ont traité des Mines, des Metaux & des Mineraux; pp.416-56, Opérations diverses pour la fonte et purification des metaux

et minéraux; sign. V1-V9, Table des matieres du Tome second; sign. V9-V10, Approbation...Privilege.

Copies: B.N.: S.20294-5; Ars.:8°S.7212; B.L.: 233.b.34-5.

Notes: There are 2 fold-out illustrations in T.I.

There would appear to have been a variant title-page with the colophon 'La Haye, chez P. de Hond[t], 1752': see La Bibliothèque raisonnée des ouvrages des savants de l'Europe, xlviii (1752), pp.408-22.

On the collaboration of Gosford in this edition see Chapter VI, p.400.

55.01 TRAITÉ/ HISTORIQUE/ ET/ DOGMATIQUE/ SUR/ Les Apparitions, les
Visions & les/ Révélations particulières./ AVEC/ Des Observations
sur les Dissertations du R.P./ Dom CALMET, Abbé de Sénones, sur les/
Apparitions & les Revenans./ Par M. l'Abbé LENGLET DUFRESNOY./ TOME
PREMIER. [TOME SECOND.] [swash T]/ [Typ.orn.]/ A AVIGNON, & se trouve
A PARIS./ Chez JEAN-NOEL LELOUP, Quay des/ Augustins, à la descente
du Pont Saint/ Michel, à S. Jean Chrysostome./ [double rule 45mm.]/
M. DCC. LI./

Variant title-page:

TRAITÉ/ HISTORIQUE/ ET/ DOGMATIQUE/ SUR/ Les APPARITIONS, les
VISIONS/ & les REVELATIONS particulieres./ AVEC/ Des Observations
sur les Dissertations du R.P. Dom/ CALMET, Abbé de Senones, sur les
Apparitions & les Revenans./ Par M. l'Abbé LENGLET DUFRESNOY./
TOME PREMIER/ [Device]/ A Avignon, & se vend/ A PARIS,/ Chez DIDOT,
Quai des Augustins, à la Bible d'or./ [double rule]/ M. DCC. LI./

12°(160x95mm.): $\pi^2 a^{12} b^{10} A-R^{12}$. Pp.[4], i-xliii, 1-408.

T.II. $\pi^2 *^4 A-S^{12} T^8$. Pp.[4], i-viii, 1-448.

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: T.I. Half-title; t.-p.; i-xxxviii, Preface; pp.xxxix-xliii, Table des chapitres Pour le Tome Premier; pp.1-291, Traité sur les Apparitions... [Chapitres I-X]; pp.292-354, Autorités des Peres...; p.355, h.-t.: Preuves pour les dix Premiers Chapitres; pp.357-84, Sentiments de Saint Augustin, Sur les Apparitions...; pp.384-408, Discours historique sur la conversion...de Constantin ...Par M. l'Abbé de Lestocq.

T.II. H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-vii, Table des Chapitres; pp.1-172, Traité sur les Apparitions... [Chapitres XI-XII]; pp.173-7, Extrait de l'Huetiana; pp.178-96, Dissertation sur l'Apparition du Prophète Samuel à Saul; pp.197-448, Pieces concernant le livre de la Vie de la Sainte Vierge Par Marie d'Agreda.

Copies: B.N.:R41548-9; B.L.: 232.1.29; Frib.: Gi.405.

Notes: There is one full-page engraved illustration in T.I.
This work was probably printed in Paris: see Chapter VI, p.403.

56.01 RECUEIL/ DE/ DISSERTATIONS/ ANCIENNES/ ET NOUVELLES,/ Sur les Apparitions, les Visions &/ les Songes./ Avec une Préface historique, par M. l'Abbé/ LENGLET DUFRESNOY./ TOME PREMIER, Partie I. [TOME PREMIER, Partie II./ TOME SECOND, Partie I./ TOME SECOND, Partie II.]/ [Typ.orn.]/ A AVIGNON, & se trouve A PARIS,/ Chez JEAN-NOEL LELOUP, Quay des/ Augustins, à la descente du Pont Saint/ Michel, à S. Jean Chrysostome./ [double rule 44mm.]/ M. DCC. LI./

Variant title-page:

RECUEIL/ DE/ DISSERTATIONS,/ ANCIENNES/ ET NOUVELLES,/ SUR LES
 APPARITIONS,/ les Visions & les Songes./ AVEC/ Une Préface
 historique & un Catalogue des/ Auteurs, qui ont écrit sur les
 Esprits, les/ Visions, les Apparitions, les Songes &/ les Sortileges./
Par M. L'ABBE' LENGLET DUFRESNOY./ TOME PREMIER. [TOME SECOND.]/
 [Typ.orn.]/ A AVIGNON,/ Et se trouve/ A PARIS, Quay des Augustins/
 Chez JEAN-NOEL LELOUP, à Saint Jean/ Chrysostome./ [double rule
 58mm.]/ M. DCC. LII./

12° (165x95mm.): *⁶ a-g¹² h⁴ A-H¹². Pp. [12], i-clxii, [14], 1-192.

T.I. P.II. π² A-M¹². Pp. [4], 1-288.

T.II.P.I. π² a⁶ A-O¹². Pp. [4], i-xii, 1-336.

T.II.P.II. π² A-N¹². Pp. [4], 1-312.

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: H.-t.; t.-p.; sign.*3-#6, Avertissement; pp.i-clxii,
 Preface; sign. gl0-gl2, Table des articles de la Préface; sign. gl2-
 h4, Table des Dissertations; pp.1-192, Dissertations sur les visions
 et apparitions.

T.I.P.II. H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.1-288, Dissertations tant anciennes que
 nouvelles sur les apparitions, les visions, &c.

T.II.P.I. H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.i-xii, Table des dissertations; p.1,
 h.-t.; pp.3-336, Recueil de dissertations....

T.II.P.II. H.-t.; t.-p.; p.1, h.-t.; pp.3-222, Recueil de disser-
 tations....; pp.223-87, Liste des principaux auteurs qui ont traité
 des Esprits, Démon, Apparitions, Songes, Magie et Spectres; pp.288-

92, Additions a la liste ci-dessus; pp.293-312, Table alphabetique des auteurs cités dans la Liste précédente.

Copies: B.N.: 8°R.24354; B.L.: 232.1.31-2; Bod.Ox.: Douce L 569-72.

Notes: Some copies are bound in 2, some in 4 vols.

The edition was probably published towards the end of the year 1751, which led Leloup to update it with a 1752 title-page. Most copies have a mixture of 4 out of the 6 possible title-pages.

Like no.55.01, this work was probably printed in Paris.

56.02 'La Conférence entre Luther et le diable au sujet de la messe, racontée par Luther lui-même. Traduction nouvelle en regard du Texte Latin par Isidore Lisieux. Avec les remarques et annotations des abbés de Cordemoy et Lenglet-Dufresnoy. Paris, Isidore Lisieux [impr. de Motteroz], 1875. In-18, vii, 95p., planche'. B.N.:Rés.D².35014 . Contains Lenglet's notes on the essay from no.56.01, T.I,P.II,pp.193-288; the 'Avant-propos' (p.vii) quotes from Lenglet's 'Préface', T.I,P.I, pp.cl-clii.

57.01 On Lenglet's contribution to the Encyclopédie, ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers, ed. Denis Diderot and Jean Le Rond d'Alembert, Paris, Libraires associés, 1751-65, see Chapter VI, pp.409ff.

58.01 HISTOIRE/ DE JEANNE DARC,/ VIERGE, HÉROÏNE/ ET MARTYRE D'ÉTAT;/ Suscitée par la Providence pour rétablir/ la Monarchie Françoisé./ Tirée des Procès & autres pieces/ originales du temps./ Infirma mundi elegit Deus, ut confundat fortia./ I. ad Corinth. I. 27./ Par M. l'Abbé LENGLET DUFRESNOY./ [SECONDE PARTIE.]/ [Typ.orn.]/

A PARIS,/ Chez [bracket enclosing 3 lines]COUTELLIER, au Palais,
Gallerie des Prisonniers./ PISSOT, Quay de Conti, à la Croix d'Or./
CHARDON fils, rue S. Jacq. à la Couronne d'Or./ [double rule 40mm.]/
M. DCC. LIII./ Avec Approbation & Privilège du Roi./

T.III.

HISTOIRE/ DE JEANNE D'ARC,/ VIERGE, HEROÏNE,/ ET MARTYRE D'ETAT;/
Suscitée par la Providence, pour rétablir/ la Monarchie Françoisse./
Tirée des divers Procès & autres Pièces/ originales du tems./
Infirma mundi elegit Deus, ut confundat fortia./ I. ad Corinth. 1.
27./ TROISIE'ME PARTIE./ [Typ.orn.]/ A ORLEANS./ [double rule 55mm.]/
M. DCC. LIV./

Variant imprint:

Ts.I-II.

/ A ORLEANS,/ Chez COURET DE VILLENEUVE le/ jeune, Imprimeur
du Roi./ [double rule 40mm.]/ [...]

Variant title page:

T.III.

HISTOIRE/ DE JEANNE DARC,/ VIERGE, HEROÏNE,/ ET MARTYRE D'ÉTAT;/
Suscitée par la Providence pour rétablir/ la Monarchie Françoisse./
Tirée des Procès & autres Pièces/ originales du temps./ Infirma
mundi elegit Deus, ut confundat gratia./ I. ad Corinth. I. 27./ Par
M. l'Abbé LENGLET DUFRESNOY./ TROISIÈME PARTIE./ [Typ.orn.]/ A
ORLEANS,/ Et se trouve/ A PARIS,/ Chez PISSOT, Quai de Conti./
[double rule]/ M. DCC. LIV./ Avec Approbation & Privilège du Roi./

12° (167x94mm.): a¹² b⁸ A-I¹² K¹. Pp.i-xl, 1-218.

T.II. π¹ A-I¹². Pp.[2], 1-209, [6].

T.III. a⁶ A-M¹² N⁸ (±N8). Pp.i-xii, 1-304.

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: T.I. P.i, t.-p.; pp.iii-vi, Dédicace à Jeanne Darc...; pp.vii-xxxvi, Préface; pp.xxxvii-xl, Approbation...Privilege du Roi; pp.1-218, Histoire de Jeanne D'Arc, dite La Pucelle d'Orleans. T.II. T.-p.; p.1, h.-t.; pp.3-181, Histoire...Seconde Partie, qui contient le Procès de sa Justification; pp.183-209, Liste des procez manuscrits, et Pieces imprimées sur Jeanne D'Arc; sign.I9-II1, Table des principaux articles; sign. II2, Avis. T.III. P.i, t.-p.; pp.iii-xii, Avertissement; pp.1-200, Divers témoignages en faveur de Jeanne D'Arc; pp.201-21, Divers systemes imaginés pour expliquer le phenomene de la Pucelle d'Orleans; pp.223-58, Parallele du courage heroique de Jeanne D'Arc, Avec celui de plusieurs autres Dames; pp.259-66, Procession d'Orleans...; pp.267-77, Indulgences pour la feste de la ville; pp.278-9, [Certificat]; pp.280-6, Lettres de noblesse, accordées par le Roy Charles VII....; pp.287-92, Additions pour les Manuscrits...; pp.293-4, Procez manuscrits...qui sont en Pays étrangers; pp.295-8, Additions pour les Traités imprimés sur la Pucelle; pp.299-302, Table des Articles; pp.302-4, Fautes à corriger.

Copies: B.N.: 8°Lb²⁶ 28; B.L.: 285.e.15-16; Bod.Ox.: Douce.L.611-13.

Notes: Ts.I and II were printed in Paris, and T.III was printed in Orléans by Couret de Villeneuve, who was very slow in completing the work (see Chapter VI, p.422); Lenglet had undertaken to distribute this 3rd vol. free to those who had bought the first 2 parts (see 'Avis' to this effect in some copies of T.II).

Due to the complaints of the Parisian imprimeurs-libraires Lenglet was forced to remove the name of De Villeneuve from T.III; a new t.-p. and final page were substituted for the original versions, but the cancellandum of sign.N8, signed by De Villeneuve, was left

intact in some copies. For Lenglet's comments on this affair see Chapter VI, p.423.

There is a copy of part of T.II and T.III in the B.N. (Rés.Lb²⁶28) with corrections and notes in Lenglet's hand, clearly written with a view to a second edition.

58.02 [Engraved headpiece, signed 'Caron inv.'; 45x133mm.:]

HISTOIRE/ DE JEANNE D'ARC/ DITE/ LA PUCELLE D'ORLEANS./ [Text from 'LE Public ... édition.']/

4°(300x231mm.): A⁴. Pp.1-8.

Contents: Pp.1-6, [Prospectus] Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc; pp.6-7, Projet pour l'impression des Grands Ouvrages de Litterature; pp.7-8, Conditions des souscriptions.

Copies: B.N.: 4°Lb²⁶28a.

Notes: The imprint on p.8 carries the names of Guillyn and Pissot, and the date 1754. It was Lenglet himself, however, who was primarily responsible for all aspects of the project, and he had probably engaged the former simply as printers (see Chapter VI, pp.423-4)

58.03 'Histoire/ de/ Jeanne d'Arc,/ dite/ la Pucelle d'Orléans./ Par M. l'abbé Langlet du Fresnoy. Amsterdam, par la Cie [Paris], 1759, 3 vol. in-12 de VIII-115; 160; 184p. et 2ff. de poésies.

Ces 2 ff. de poésies, placés entre les p.VIII et 1 du t.I, sont des extraits du Recueil d'inscriptions de Charles du Lis.

Cette seconde édit. est moins complète que la précédente en ce qu'elle n'a pas la table et que la préface a été abrégée'. (Pierre Lanéry d'Arc, Le Livre d'or de Jeanne d'Arc: bibliographie raisonnée et analytique, Paris, Leclerc et Cornuau, 1894, p.103).

This was clearly a pirate edition, published without a privilege;

Lelong/ Fontette also asserts that it was published in Paris (Bibliothèque historique de la France, vol.ii, no.17221).

According to Lanéry, no.58.04 is a separate issue of the same edition, with a new t.-p.

58.04 HISTOIRE/ DE/ JEANNE D'ARC,/ DITE/ LA PUCELLE D'ORLEANS./ Par
M. 1'abbé LANGLET DU FRESNOY./ PREMIERE PARTIE. [SECONDE PARTIE./
TROISIEME PARTIE.]/ [Device: fleuron; 30x37mm.]/ A AMSTERDAM,/ PAR
LA COMPAGNIE/ [rule 58mm.]/ M. DCC. LXXV./

12°(162x98mm.): $\pi^1 a^6 A^5 B-E^{12} F^5$. Pp.[2], i-viii,[4], 1-115.

P.II. $\pi^1 A^6 B-G^{12} H^2$. Pp.[2], 1-160.

P.III. $\pi^1 A^9 B-G^{12} H^{11}$. Pp.[2], 1-184.

Production: Signs. roman 1-5 (irregular). Quire catchwords.

Contents: Text as in no.58.01, but the 'Préface' has been abridged, and most of Lenglet's additions, tables and bibliographies have been omitted.

Copies: Maz.:32786 B; B.L.: 10662.de.25; Bod.Ox.: Douce.F.437.

Notes: The 3 Parts are normally bound in one volume.

Cf. above no.58.04 re place of publication etc.

58.05 MEMOIRS/ OF/ JOAN D'ARC, or, DU LYS ,/ COMMONLY CALLED,/ THE MAID
OF ORLEANS,/ CHIEFLY FROM THE FRENCH OF/ THE ABBE LENGLET DU
FRESNOY,/ WITH/ AN APPENDIX AND NOTES,/ [ornamental rule 12mm.]/
By GEO. ANN GRAVE./ [ornamental rule 12mm.]/ Non tamen indecorem tua
te regina relinquet/ Extremâ jam in morte; neque hoc sine nomine

letum/ Per gentes erit, aut famam patieris inultâe./ VIRGIL. ÆN./
 Nor yet in death thy goddess will disclaim/ Her favour'd maid,
 but crown with endless fame!/ Thy praise shall round the nations be
 display'd,/ And to thy fate due vengeance shall be paid./ PITT./
 [double rule 21mm.]/ EGHAM./ [double rule, 7mm.]/ PRINTED BY C.C.
 WETTON,/ FOR/ LONGMAN, HURST, REES, ORME, AND BROWN,/ LONDON./
 1812./

8° (220x142mm.): π^2 a-b⁸ c⁶ B-O⁸ P² χ^1 . Pp. [4], i-xlvi, 1-212, [2].

Production: Signs. arabic 1-2. No catchwords.

Contents: Translation, in an abridged version, of part of Lenglet's
 text, with notes etc. by the editor.

Copies: B.N.: Lb²⁶ 29; B.L.: 286.g.16; Bod.Ox.: 210.e.207.

58.06 'Observations sur l'in vraisemblance du mariage de la Pucelle
 d'après Lenglet du Fresnoy', in Collection des meilleurs disser-
tations, notices et traités relatifs à l'histoire de France, ed.
 Leber, Salgues and Cohen, Paris, Dentu, 1826-38, xvii, 401-7.

59.01 PLAN/ DE L'HISTOIRE/ GÉNÉRALE ET PARTICULIERE/ DE LA/ MONARCHIE
 FRANÇOISE./ Où l'on trouve l'Histoire des Rois, celle des/ Maisons
 illustres, des Fiefs, des Char-/ ges & des Grands Hommes./ Par M.
l'Abbé LENGLET DUFRESNOY./ TOME PREMIER. [TOME SECOND./ TOME
 TROISIEME.]/ [Typ.orn.]/ A PARIS,/ Chez [bracket enclosing 3 lines]
 LA VEUVE PIERRE GANDOUIN,/ DIDOT, Quay des Augustins./ CHARDON,

Fils, rue S. Jacques./ [triple rule 65mm.]/ M. DCC. LIII./ Avec
Approbation & Privilege du Roi./

T.II.: There is a comma after 'VEUVE', a full-stop after 'GANDOUIN',
 and a full-stop missing in 'S Jacques.'

T.III. There is a full-stop after 'GANDOUIN'.

Variant title-page:

T.III.

PLAN/ [.]FRANÇOISE./ Par M. l'Abbé LENGLET DUFRESNOY./ TOME
 TROISIEME./ [Device: cul-de-lampe; 35x43mm.]/ A PARIS,/ Chez
 [bracket enclosing 3 lines] La VEUVE Pierre GANDOUIN,/ ET/
 DIDOT, Quay des Augustins./ [double rule 55mm.]/ M. DCC. LIII./
Avec Approbation & Privilege du Roy./

12° (156x88mm.): $\pi^4 \tilde{e}^4 A-Q^{12} R^8$. Pp. i-xvi, 1-396, [4].

T.II. $\pi^2 a-d^{12} A-Q^{12}$. Pp. [4], i-xlvi, 1-384.

T.III. $\pi^1 A^{12} (\pm A1) B-I^{12} K^{12} (\pm K12) L^{12} M^{12} (\pm M1) N^{12} O^{12} (\pm O10) P^{12} (\pm P1, 10-12)$
 $Q^{12} (\pm Q1-12) R^{12} (\pm R1, 3)$. Pp. [4], 1-408.

Production: Signs. roman 1-6. Quire catchwords.

Contents: T.I. H.-t.; t.-p.; [4pp.], A Monsieur le Comte de Chabannes;
 pp. i-xvi, Preface; pp. 1-325, Plan de l'histoire generale...; pp. 326-
 35, Rois des Gaulois, dont il est parlé dans l'Histoire; pp. 336-
 42, Préfets du Pretoire...; pp. 343-4, Rois françois avant leur entrée
 dans les Gaules; pp. 345-92, De la Sainteté du Roy Louys dict Clovis;
 pp. 393-6, Table des chapitres ou articles; Approbation...Privilege
 du Roi.

T.II. H.-t.; t.-p.; pp. i-xlvi, Discours sur l'etude de la troisieme
 race; pp. 1-380, Troisieme race des Rois de France; pp. 381-3, Table

des articles et des rois; p.384, J'Avois dessein de mettre ici une dissertation sur le fait de la Pucelle d'Orléans....

T.III.H.-t.; t.-p.; pp.3-390, Suite de la troisieme race des Rois de France; pp.391-405, Pieces ou preuves citées ci-dessus; pp.406-8, Table des articles et des rois.

Copies: B.N.: 8°L³⁵132; Ars.:8°H.5383; B.L.: 284.a.25.

Notes: There are 2 fold-out tables in T.I.

On the subject of the Dedication, which was suppressed by the censor, and the cartons in T.III, see Chapter VI, pp.427 ff. The Dedication is in fact included in most of the copies I have seen, but the cancellanda in T.III appear to have been left intact in only a small number of copies (see Ars. copy, and Cardinal Passionei's copy, with ms. markings by Lenglet, which is preserved in the Biblioteca Angelica, Rome).

BIBLIOGRAPHY II

A. Manuscript sources

Archives du Ministère des Affaires Etrangères

Correspondance politique. Autriche. Vol.138, ff.287-90.

Vol.139, f.209.

Vol.140, ff.41-340 (autograph letters, 'Mémoires', etc.).

Vol.141, ff.21-289 (autograph letters).

Correspondance politique. Cologne. Vol.57, ff.149ff., and Vol.58, passim. (letters from the Baron Karg, written in Lenglet's hand).

Mémoires et documents. France. Vol.496. Histoire du Congrès tenu à Soissons pendant le cours de l'année 1728 entre les Ministres plénipotentiaires des principales puissances de l'Europe, faite en décembre 1736 par N.L. Le Dran, premier commis des Affaires étrangères.

Archives nationales. Minutier central des notaires de Paris

Etude XLIX, Liasse 795, 30 Sep. 1763.

Etude LXVII, Liasse 308, 20 Mar. 1715; Liasse 330, 27 Jan. 1719;

Liasse 403, 20 Mar. 1726.

Etude XCV, Liasse 142, 6 Oct. 1737; Liasse 238, 31 Jan. 1755; Liasse 239, 1, 4 and 15 Mar. 1755; Liasse 290, 10 Sep. 1763.

Etude XCVII, Liasse 430, 4 Feb. 1769.

Etude CXI, Liasse 185, 14 Jan. 1737.

Archives de Paris

DC⁶ 225, f.121 (Urbain de la Barre, Testament insinué).

DC⁶ 251, f.168 (Marguerite Lenglet, Testament insinué).

5 AZ 3303, 4 and 27 Nov. 1730 (La Barre, affaire d'honneur).

Archives de la Préfecture de Police, Paris

F⁷ A^A. Série Bastille, Année 1696 and Année 1735.

Archives du Service historique de l'armée

Série A¹ (Correspondance Ancien Régime). Registre no.2135, document no.441. Reg. 2149, doc. 108, 111, 112, 121, 128, 133, 134, 135, 165 (autograph letters).

Reg. 2154, doc. 77, 78, 87, 89.

Reg. 2155, doc. 27, 28, 29, 56, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69 (autograph letters and 'Mémoires').

Reg. 2309, doc. 183.

Reg. 2311, doc. 176, 199, 200.

Reg. 2344, doc. 265, 277.

Reg. 2396, doc. 355.

Reg. 2411, doc. 84, 85 (autograph letter).

Reg. 2413, doc. 35, 36, 200, 201, 202, 318 (autograph letter).

Reg. 2421, doc. 112, 113.

Biblioteca Angelica, Rome

Letter 8 Nov. 1749 (autograph copy): bound with Relation de la conspiration tramée par le Bacha de Rhodes (C 6 28 xxxv).

Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

Vat. Lat. 9810, ff.31-2 (autograph letter).
 Vat. Lat. 9813, ff.8-71 (29 autograph letters).
 Vat. Lat. 9815, ff.36-8 (autograph letter).

Biblioteca comunale, Forlì

Collezione Piancastelli, ff.611-738 (12 autograph letters).

Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal

6033, ff.53-60. Mémoire adressée au R.P. Hongnant, de la compagnie de Jésus, et auteur du journal qui s'imprime à Trévoux.

(Not yet classified). Sur les Memoires de Condé (autograph).

Archives de la Bastille

10134, f.76. Ordres, 1723-7 (Antoine Lenglet).
 10166, f.150. Gazetins secrets de la police, 1737-8 (on 'abbé du frénois').
 10505, ff.178-88. Interrogations. 1696.
 10663. Ordre. 1719.
 10784, ff.266-89. Antoine Lenglet. 1723-4.
 10801. Malversations dans l'extraordinaire des guerres. 1726. Registres etc. (autograph letter).
 10836, ff.253-91. Affaire de l'abbé Antoine Langlet de Courcelles. Ordres etc. 1724-32 (autograph letters).
 10880, ff.251-76. Tableaux, ordres etc. 1718-52 (autograph letters).
 10887, f.316. Ordre. 1725.
 11301, ff.81-96. Langlet de Percel. 1735 (autograph 'Mémoires').
 11531, f.338. Note. 1743.
 11534, ff.299-300. Tableaux. 1743.
 11717, ff.226-9. Notes, etc. 1750-1.
 11754, ff.275-7. Ordres, etc. 1751-2.
 12479, ff.33, 61, 62, 72. Ecrous. 1718-25.
 12482, ff.84, 268, 223, 318. Ecrous. 1718-25.
 12484, f.44. Ecrou. 1743.
 12486, f.184. Lettre. 1725.
 12488, f.34. Note. 1733 (on 'abbé Dufresnoy').
 12491, f.172. Lettre. 1743.
 12521. Reconnaissance. 1724. Mme de la Barre.
 12550, f.96. Tableaux. 1725-33.
 12564. Tableaux. 1750.
 12565. Tableaux. 1751-2.
 12581. Sortie. 1743.
 12604. Instructions des ministres pour la formation d'une bibliothèque de la Bastille. Différents catalogues... 1745 (autograph list).

Bibliothèque municipale de Chartres

1718, f.138 (autograph letter), and f.142

Bibliothèque municipale de Rouen

Collection Duputel. Cartons V-VI, no.698 (autograph letter).

Bibliothèque nationale

Imprimés

Registres de prêt de la Bibliothèque du Roy. Prêt 1-8. (1740-52).
8 vols. in-4°.

Manuscripts

Cabinet des Titres. Dossiers bleus, 381. Langlet, 10238.

Collection Joly de Fleury. 1101. Fort l'Eveque 1750. Note.

Collection Moreau. 1558, ff.31ff. Table alphabétique du glossaire de l'abbé Langlet sur le Roman de la Rose. (By Jean-Baptiste de Lacurne de Sainte-Palaye).

1567, f.7. Lettre.

Fichier Charavay (compiled from the Catalogues de vente). Lenglet-Dufresnoy.

Fonds français.

6363-4. Abregé d'histoire universelle (by Henri de Boulainvilliers).

7646, ff.200-1, 250. Ordres du Roy. 1724.

7647, ff.4, 21, 42, 44. Ordres du Roy. 1725-6.

22092, ff.149 and 367. Arrêts du Conseil d'Etat, etc. 1750 and 1754.

22109, ff.34-8. Lettre adressée à M. de Machault Contrôleur général des finances par le S. abbé Lenglet Dufresnoy, sous le nom du Chevalier de Lussan. 1751.

Correspondance du Président Jean Bouhier:

24409, ff.106-7, 393-5, 405-6.

24410, ff.71-2, 79-80, 98-9, 174-5.

24411, ff.247-8.

24413, ff.757-60, 853-6.

24414, ff.270-1, 315-6, 510-11, 514-17, 522-3.

24416, ff.196-9.

24418, ff.370-3.

24421, ff.178-9, 193-4.

25541, ff.31-2.

25542, ff.78-9, 82-3, 209-12, 256-7, 311-2.

Fonds français, nouvelles acquisitions.

1891, ff.55, 147-50, 463, 467-8. Prisonniers qui ont été détenus à la Bastille...1660-1754.

1961, ff.161-4 (Corr. de Bouhier).

3336, ff.466-8. Mémoire sur le retablissement de la Discipline Ecclesiastique troublée par les Contestations presentes de l'Eglise.

3344 (Coll. Anisson. Librairie sous M. de Malesherbes). Ff.1-42: Affaire de l'abbé Lenglet. Son Plan de l'histoire...de la monarchie française.

Ff.43-4: Mémoire pour l'abbé Lenglet Dufresnoy (re Part III of the Histoire de Jeanne d'Arc). Ff.45-6: Mémoire (addressed to Malesherbes, re the Plan de l'histoire). F.47: Requête au Roi. Ff.48-53: Services que l'abbé Lenglet Dufresnoy a rendu à la Religion, à l'Etat et au Roy.

F.54: Note, de la main de Malesherbes, sur une conversation avec l'abbé

Lenglet.Ff.55-6.Arrêt du Conseil (re the Plan de l'histoire). Ff.57-70: cancellanda from the Plan de l'histoire. Ff.71-3: 2 lettres de Malesherbes (on the suppression of the Plan).
 4300, ff.15-16, 29-30, 47-8, 55-8, 63-4, 199-200 (Corr. de Bouhier).
 4384, ff.98-9, 106-7, 118-19, 124-5, 189-92, 231-2 (Corr. de Bouhier).
 10782, f.101. Note de Police (by J.d'Hémery, Inspecteur de la librairie).

Fonds latin. 15440. Ordo licentiatorum S. Facultatis (1373-88). P.358.

Bibliothèque de la ville de Tonnerre

Correspondance et papiers de famille du chevalier d'Eon. T.5. Letter de Longuemare to Déon de Beaumont (1755), 4ff. T.6. Letter de Beaumont to de Longuemare, 2ff. T.7, Letter de Longuemare to de Beaumont, 2ff.

British Library

Add. 4057, f.94 (autograph letter to Sir H. Sloane).
 Egerton 1667, ff.38 and 101. Registre des entrées des prisonniers à la Bastille. 1750-1.

Columbia University in the City of New York

Butler Library

Jeanne d'Arc Collection. 5 letters from Lenglet to Polluche (autograph). 1753-4.

Museum Calvet. Avignon.

Correspondance de la marquise d'Huxelles et du marquis de la Garde. T.II, f.128. 1709.

Österreichisches Staatsarchiv, Vienna.

Belgien. B33.
 C: DD Abt B (Sonderreihe).
 DD 136 b 1/2.

Rijksarchief in de Provincie Utrecht

Fonds Port-Royal. 1040. Letter Fouillou to Quesnel, 2 Aug. 1711.

B. Printed works cited in the thesis

1. Periodical publications, from which individual articles are listed in the notes

L'Année littéraire. Ed. Fréron, et al. Amsterdam and Paris. 1754-90. 292 vols.

Bibliothèque annuelle et universelle, contenant le catalogue des livres imprimés en Europe. Paris. 1748-50. 3 vols.

Bibliothèque française, ou histoire littéraire de la France. Ed. Camusat, Du Sauzet, Granet and Goujet. Amsterdam. 1723-46. 42 vols.

Bibliothèque impartiale. Leyden. 1750-8. 18 vols.

Bibliothèque raisonnée des ouvrages des savants de l'Europe. Amsterdam. 1728-53. 50 vols. and 2 vols. Tables.

La Bigarrure, ou mélange curieux, instructif et amusant de nouvelles et de critique. The Hague. 1749-53. 20 vols.

La Clef du cabinet des princes de l'Europe, ou Recueil historique et politique sur les matières du temps. Luxembourg, later Verdun. 1704-76. Table générale, 9 vols.

Journal littéraire. Ed. Saint-Hyacinthe et al. The Hague. 1713-22, and 1728-37. 24 vols.

Journal des savants. Paris. 1665-1789. 114 vols. (in-4°).

Jugements sur quelques ouvrages nouveaux. Ed. Desfontaines et al. Avignon. 1744-6. 11 vols.

Mémoires pour l'histoire des sciences et des beaux-arts. Trévoux. 1701-67.

Mercure de France. Paris. 1672-1789.

Nouveaux mémoires d'histoire, de critique et de littérature. Ed. Gachet d'Artigny. Paris. 1749-56. 7 vols.

Nouvelles littéraires, contenant ce qui se passe de plus considérable dans la république des lettres. Ed. du Sauzet. The Hague. 1715-20. 11 vols.

Le Nouvelliste du Parnasse, ou réflexions sur les ouvrages nouveaux. Ed. Desfontaines and Granet. Paris. 1730-2. 4 vols.

Observations sur les écrits modernes. Ed. Desfontaines et al. Paris. 1735-43. 34 vols.

Le Pour et contre. Ed. Prévost. Paris. 1733-40. 20 vols.

Réflexions sur les ouvrages de littérature. Ed. Granet. Paris. 1738-9. 10 vols.

11. Works published before 1800

AMALETUS, Josephus. Epistolae ad virum clarissimum DN. Nicolaum Lenglet du Fresnoy. Verona, 1755.

ARGENS, Jean-Baptiste de Boyer, marquis d'. La Philosophie du bon sens, ou Réflexions philosophiques sur l'incertitude des connaissances. 2nd edition. The Hague, Paupie, 1746.

BAILLET, Adrien. Des Enfants devenus célèbres par leurs études ou par leurs écrits. Paris, Dezallier, 1688.

BARRAL, Pierre, GUIBAUD, P. and VALLA, P. Dictionnaire historique, littéraire et critique. N.p., 1758-9. 6 vols.

BAYLE, Pierre. Dictionnaire historique et critique. Rotterdam, Leers, 1697. 2 vols. 2nd edition: id., 1702. 3 vols.

BEAUMONT, Déon de. 'Mort de M. l'abbé Lenglet du Fresnoy'. L'Année littéraire, vol. iii (1755), pp.116-39.

BENEDICT XIV, Pope (Prospero LAMBERTINI). De Servorum Dei beatificatione et beatorum canonizatione. Bologna, Longhi, 1734-8. 4 vols.

BEYER, August. Memoriae historico-criticae librorum rariorum. Dresden and Leipzig, Hekel, 1734.

BOUREAU-DESLANDES, André-François. Histoire critique de la philosophie. Amsterdam, Changuion, 1737-50. 3 vols.

BURE, Guillaume-François de. Bibliographie instructive, ou Traité de la connaissance des livres rares et singuliers. Paris, de Bure, 1763-8. 7 vols.

CALMET, Dom Augustin. Traité sur les apparitions des esprits et sur les vampires. 4th edition. Paris, de Bure, 1751. 2 vols.

Catalogue des livres de la bibliothèque de feu M. Le Blanc, Secrétaire d'Etat. Paris, Martin, 1729.

Catalogue des livres de la bibliothèque de feu M. le duc de la Vallière. Ière partie. Paris, de Bure l'aîné, 1783. 4 vols.

Catalogue des livres du cabinet de M. de Boze. Paris, Martin, 1745.

Catalogue des livres provenant de la bibliothèque de feu M. de Boze. Paris, Martin, 1754.

Catalogus librorum bibliothecae...Caroli Henrici comitis de Hoym. Paris, Martin, 1738.

Catalogus librorum, in vario genere insignium...Quibus utebatur celeberrimus vir, D. Jacobus Basnagius, Eques, Ecclesiae Haganae Pastor fidelissimus. The Hague, Swart, 1724.

DREUX DU RADIER, Jean-François. L'Europe illustrée. Paris, Odieuvre, 1765.

DUCLOS, Charles Pineau. Histoire de Louis XI. Paris, Guerin, 1745.

EGITTIO, Matteo. Lettre amiable d'un Napolitain à M. l'Abbé Lenglet du Fresnoy. Par laquelle il est prié de corriger quelque endroit de sa géographie, touchant le royaume de Naples. Paris, Barois fils, 1738.

Encyclopédie, ou dictionnaire raisonné des sciences, des arts et des métiers. Ed. Denis Diderot and Jean Le Rond d'Alembert. Paris, Libraires associés, 1751-65. 17 vols.

ERSCH, Johann Samuel. La France littéraire, contenant les auteurs français de 1771 à 1796. Hamburg, Hoffmann, 1797-8. 3 vols. Premier supplément, 1802. Second supplément, 1806.

GACHET D'ARTIGNY, Abbé Antoine. Relation de ce qui s'est passé dans une assemblée tenue au bas du Parnasse pour la réforme des belles-lettres. The Hague, Paupie, 1739.

GOUJET, Abbé Claude-Pierre. Bibliothèque française ou histoire de la littérature française. Paris, Mariette et Guerin, 1741-56. 18vols.

GOURNE, Abbé Pierre-Mathias de. Le Géographe méthodique, ou Introduction à la géographie ancienne et moderne, à la chronologie et à l'histoire. Paris, Robinot, 1741-2. 2 vols.

GOURNE, Abbé Pierre-Mathias de. Lettre de M. de Gourné, Prieur commendataire de Notre-Dame de Taverny, auteur du Géographe méthodique. A Dom Gilbert, Bénédictin de la Congrégation de Saint-Maur, tant au sujet de cet ouvrage que du Sr. abbé Des Fontaines. Amsterdam, L'Honoré, 1743.

GOURNE, Abbé Pierre-Mathias de. [Requête relativement aux attaques dont le Géographe méthodique a été l'objet, 17 décembre 1742]. N.p., n.d.

HEBRAÏL, J. d', and DE LA PORTE, J. La France littéraire. Paris, Veuve Duchesne, 1769. Supplément, and Nouveau supplément, 1784. 2 vols.

Histoire de l'Académie royale des inscriptions et belles-lettres, depuis son établissement...avec les Mémoires de littérature. Paris, Imprimerie royale, 1717-1809. 56 vols. (in-4°).

JORDAN, Charles-Etienne. Histoire d'un voyage littéraire fait en 1733 en France, en Angleterre et en Hollande. The Hague, Moetiens, 1735.

LADVOCAT, Abbé. Dictionnaire historique et bibliographique portatif. 2nd edition. Paris, Le Clerc, 1777. 3 vols.

LELONG, Jacques (Or.). Catalogue des ouvrages, imprimés et manuscrits, qui traitent de l'histoire de ce royaume, ou qui y ont rapport, avec des notes critiques et historiques. Nouvelle édition. Ed. Favret de Fontette. Paris, Herissant, 1768-78. 5 vols.

Lettre de M**** à M***, au sujet du Nouvel abrégé chronologique de l'histoire de l'Europe. N.p., n.d.

LEVESQUE DE BURIGNY, Jean. Histoire de la philosophie payenne, ou sentiments des philosophes et des peuples payens les plus célèbres sur Dieu, sur l'âme et sur les devoirs de l'homme. The Hague, Gosse, 1724. 2 vols.

MAICHEL, Daniel. Introductio ad historiam literariam de praecipuis bibliothecis parisiensibus. Cambridge, Crownfield, 1721.

MAILLART, Adrien. Coutumes générales d'Artois. 2nd edition. Paris, 1739. 2vols.

MAILLART, Adrien. Mémoire signifié. Cause à plaider à la chambre criminelle du Châtelet de Paris, pour M. Adrien Maillart...contre M. Nicolas Lenglet du Frenoy. Paris, Impr. de Paulus-du-Mesnil, 1741.

MAYEUL-CHAUDON, L. Bibliothèque d'un homme de goût. Avignon, Blery, 1772. 2 vols.

Mémoires de l'Académie royale des sciences (Année 1666-99). Paris, 1733-4. 11 vols. Followed by: Histoire de l'Académie...avec les mémoires de mathématique et de physique (Année 1699-1790). Paris, 1702-97. 93 vols.

MICHAULT, Jean-Bernard. Lettres choisies de M. de la Rivière. Paris, de Bure l'aîné, 1751. 2 vols.

MICHAULT, Jean-Bernard. Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire de la vie et des ouvrages de Monsieur l'abbé Lenglet du Fresnoy. Londres (Paris), 1761.

MORERI, Louis. Le Grand dictionnaire historique, sacré et profane. Nouvelle édition dans laquelle on a refondu les suppléments de M. l'abbé Goujet. Paris, 1759.

PASSIONEI, Cardinal Domenico. Acta apostolicae legationis helveticae ab anno 1723 ad annum 1729. Tugli, Schell, 1729. 2nd edition: Rome, Mainardi, 1738.

The Philosophical transactions of the Royal Society. London, 1665- .

PREVOST, Abbé Antoine-François (ed.). Histoire de ce qui s'est passé de plus remarquable dans toutes les parties du monde depuis MDXLV jusqu'en MDCVII, écrite en latin par Mre Jacques-Auguste de Thou. Traduite en français et augmentée d'un grand nombre de passages considérables qui ont été retranchés dans les éditions latines. The Hague, Gosse et Neaulme, 1733. Vol. 1.

MARCHAND, Prosper. Dictionnaire historique, ou mémoires critiques et littéraires. The Hague, de Hondt, 1758-9.

TAILLEFER, Antoine. Tableau historique de l'esprit et du caractère des littérateurs français. Versailles, Poinçot, 1785. 4 vols.

TASSIN, Dom René Prosper, and TOUSTAIN, Dom C.F. Nouveau traité de diplomatique. Paris, 1750-65. 6 vols.

Transactions philosophiques de la Société royale de Londres. Trans. by M. de Brémont. Paris, 1741.

VALART, l'abbé Joseph. Géographie abrégée. Paris, Robinot, 1743.

VOLTAIRE, François-Marie Arouet de. Abrégé de l'histoire universelle. The Hague, 1753, 2 vols.

VOLTAIRE, François-Marie Arouet de. Questions sur l'Encyclopédie. N.p., 1770-2. 9 vols.

iii. Works published since 1800

AUVRAY, Paul. Richard Simon: 1638-1712, étude bio-bibliographique. Paris, P.U.F., 1974.

BACKER, Augustin de. Essai bibliographique sur le livre De Imitatione Christi. Liège, Grandmont-Donders, 1864.

BARBER, Giles. 'Catchwords and press figures at home and abroad'. The Book collector, vol. ix(1960), pp.301-7.

BARBIER, Antoine-Alexandre. Dictionnaire des ouvrages anonymes, 5th edition. Paris, Daffis, 1872-89. 4 vols.

BARBIER, Antoine-Alexandre. Dissertation sur 60 traductions françaises de l'Imitation de Jésus-Christ. Paris, Lefèvre, 1812.

BARBIER, Edmond-Jean-François. Chronique de la Régence et du règne de Louis XV (1718-1763). Journal de Barbier, avocat au Parlement de Paris. 1ère édition complète. Paris, Charpentier, 1866. 8 vols.

BARTHELEMY, C. 'Deux lettres inédites de l'abbé Lenglet du Fresnoy (de Beauvais) et de Gresset (d'Amiens)': Bulletin de la société des antiquaires de Picardie, vol. iv(1850-2), pp.148-50.

BELIN, Jean-Paul. Le Commerce des livres prohibés à Paris de 1750 à 1789. New York, Burt Franklin [Paris, Belin frères, 1918].

BELIN, Jean-Paul. Le Mouvement philosophique de 1748 à 1789. Etude sur la diffusion des idées des philosophes à Paris d'après les documents concernant l'histoire de la librairie. New York, Burt Franklin [Paris, Belin frères, 1913].

BESTERMAN, Theodore. Voltaire. London, Longman, 1970.

Biographie nationale, publiée par l'Académie Royale des Sciences, des Lettres et des Beaux-arts de Belgique. Brussels, Buggenhoudt, 1866- .

Biographie universelle ancienne et moderne. Nouvelle édition revue, corrigée et considérablement augmentée...par une société de gens de lettres. [Ed. Louis Gabriel Michaud.] Paris, Desplaces, and Leipzig, Brockhaus, 1843. 45 vols.

BLUCHE, F. and DURYE, P. L'Anoblissement par charges avant 1789. (Les Cahiers nobles, vols. xxiii-iv). Paris, 1962.

BONNEFON, Paul (ed.). Correspondance de Jean-Baptist Rousseau et de Brossette. Paris, Cornély, 1910-11. 2 vols.

BONNEFON, Paul. 'J.-B. Rousseau et Lenglet du Fresnoy'. Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France, vol. vii(1900), pp.546-89.

BOSSUET, Jacques Bénigne. Correspondance. Ed. C. Urbain and E. Levesque. Paris, Hachette, 1909-25. 15 vols.

BOUHIER, Jean. Correspondance littéraire du Président Bouhier. Ed. Henri Duranton. Université de Saint-Etienne, 1974-7. 5 vols.

BOULAINVILLIERS, Henri de. Henri de Boulainviller. Oeuvres philosophiques. Ed. Renée Simon. The Hague, Nijhoff, 1973-5. 2 vols.

BRAUBACH, Max. Geschichte und Abenteuer, Gestalten um den Prinzen Eugen. Munich, F. Bruckmann, 1950.

BRAUBACH, Max. Prinz Eugen von Savoyen. Eine Biographie. Munich, Oldenburg, 1963, 5 vols.

BRIEN, Manson Milner. 'The censorship of Lenglet du Fresnoy's Méthode pour étudier l'histoire, 1729'. Papers of the Michigan Academy, vol. xix(1933), pp.427-39.

BRIEN, Manson Milner. 'The development of critical editing by the abbé Lenglet du Fresnoy'. Papers of the Michigan Academy, vol. xxiii (1937), pp.507-16.

BRIEN, Manson Milner. 'Lenglet du Fresnoy, a bibliography [sic. for 'a biography']'. Papers of the Michigan Academy, vol. xviii(1932), pp.457-78.

BRIEN, Manson Milner. 'Nicolas Lenglet du Fresnoy in the Low Countries, 1721'. Papers of the Michigan Academy, vol. xx(1935), pp.497-504.

BRIEN, Manson Milner. 'Note on the birthplace of abbé Lenglet du Fresnoy'. The Romanic Review, vol. xxv(1934), pp.378-80.

BROOKS, Richard A. 'Voltaire and Garcilaso de la Vega'. Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, vol. xxx(1964), pp.189-204.

BRUNET, Jacques-Charles. Manuel du libraire et de l'amateur de livres. 5th edition. Paris, Maisonneuve et Larose, 1860-5. 6 vols. and 2 vols. Supplément.

CARREYRE, Jean. Le Jansénisme durant la Régence. Louvain, Bureau de la Revue d'histoire ecclésiastique, 1929-33. 3 vols.

CHAPMAN, R. W. Cancels. London, Constable, 1930.

CHAPOTIN, Marie-Dominique (O.P.). Une page de l'histoire du vieux Paris: le Collège de Dormans-Beauvais. Paris, Durand et Pedone-Lauriel, 1870.

COBBAN, Alfred. A History of modern France. 3rd edition. London, Penguin, 1963, vol. i.

COGNET, Louis. Le Jansénisme. 4th edition. Paris, P.U.F. (Collection Que sais-je), 1975.

COHEN, Henri. Guide de l'amateur de livres à gravures du XVIIIe siècle. Paris, Rouquette, 1912.

DANGEAU, Philippe de Courcillon, Marquis de. Le Journal du Marquis de Dangeau, publié en entier pour la première fois par MM. Eud. Soulié

et L. Dussieux avec les Additions inédites du Duc de Saint-Simon publiées par M. Feuillet de Conches. Paris, Didot, 1854-60. 19 vols.

DARNTON, Robert. The Business of Enlightenment. A publishing history of the Encyclopédie, 1775-1800. Cambridge/London, Harvard University Press, 1979.

DAUMARD, A. and F. FURET. Structures et relations sociales à Paris au milieu du XVIIIe siècle. Paris, Armand Colin, 1961.

DELORT, Joseph. Histoire de la détention des philosophes et des gens de lettres à la Bastille. 2nd edition. Paris, Didot père et fils, 1881 [reprint Slatkine, 1967]. 3 vols.

Dictionary of national biography. Ed. Leslie Stephen. London, Smith, Elder & Co., 1885- .

Dictionnaire de biographie française. Paris, Letouzey et Ané, 1933- .

DIDEROT, Denis. Correspondance. Ed. Georges Roth, Paris, Les éditions de minuit, 1955-1970. 16 vols.

DROUON, Henri. Bossuet à Meaux. Paris, 1900.

DUPONT-WHITE, J. T. Mélanges historiques, littéraires et archéologiques. Beauvais, 1847.

EHRARD, Jean. L'Idée de nature en France dans la première moitié du XVIIIe siècle. Paris, S.E.V.P.E.N., 1963.

FAUQUEUX, Charles. Beauvais, son histoire, des origines à nos jours. Beauvais, Imprimerie Centrale Administrative, 1938.

FENELON, François de Salignac de la Mothe. Correspondance. Ed. Jean Orcibal. Paris, Klincksieck, 1972- .

FERTE, Henri. Rollin, sa vie, ses oeuvres et l'Université de son temps. Paris, Hachette, 1902.

FERTE, Jeanne. La Vie religieuse dans les campagnes parisiennes. Paris, Vrin, 1962.

FUNCK-BRENTANO, Frantz. Les Lettres de cachet à Paris; étude, suivie d'une liste des prisonniers de la Bastille, 1659-1789. Paris, Imprimerie Nationale, 1903.

FURET, François. 'La "librairie" du royaume de France au XVIIIe siècle', in Livre et société dans la France du XVIIIe siècle'. Paris, Mouton, 1965, vol.i, pp.3-31.

GASKELL, Philip. A New introduction to bibliography. Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1972.

GAY, Jean. Bibliographie des ouvrages relatifs à l'amour, aux femmes et au mariage, et des livres facétieux, panta-gruéliques, scatologiques, satyriques, etc. Lille, Becour, 1897. 4 vols.

- GAY, Peter. The Enlightenment. An Interpretation. London, Weidenfeld and Nicolson, 1967, vol. 1.
- GAZIER, Augustin. Histoire générale du mouvement janséniste depuis ses origines jusqu'à nos jours. Paris and Besançon, 1924. 2 vols.
- GIBBON, Edward. Memoirs of my life. Ed. A. Bonnard. London, Nelson, 1966.
- GIGAS, Emile. Choix de la correspondance inédite de Pierre Bayle. (Lettres inédites de divers savants, vol.1). Copenhagen, Gad, 1890-3.
- GOSSMAN, Lionel. Medievalism and the ideologies of the Enlightenment: the world and work of Lacurne de Sainte-Palaye. Baltimore, John Hopkins, 1968.
- GOUBERT, Pierre. Beauvais et le Beauvaisis de 1600 à 1730. Contribution à l'histoire sociale de la France du XVIIe siècle. Paris, S.E.V.P.E.N., 1960.
- GOUBERT, Pierre. Familles marchandes sous l'Ancien Régime: les Danse et les Motte, de Beauvais. Paris, S.E.V.P.E.N., 1959.
- GRAESSE, Jean Georges Théodore. Trésor des livres rares et précieux ou Nouveau dictionnaire bibliographique. Dresden, Kuntze, 1859-69.
- GRIMM, Friedrich Melchior, et al. Correspondance littéraire, philosophique et critique. Ed. M. Tourneux. Paris, Garnier, 1877-82, 16 vols.
- GRUBBS, Henry A. Jean-Baptiste Rousseau, his life and works. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1941.
- GUY, Basil. The French image of China before and after Voltaire. (Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, vol. xxi), 1963.
- HANLEY, William. 'The policing of thought: censorship in eighteenth-century France'. Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, vol. clxxxiii, pp.265-95.
- HAUSER, Henri. 'Du recueil intitulé Mémoires de Condé'. Revue d'histoire moderne et contemporaine, vol. xvi(1911), pp.50-61.
- HAUTCOEUR, Edouard. Histoire de l'église collégiale et du chapitre de Saint-Pierre de Lille. Lille, L. Quarré, 1896-9. 3 vols.
- HENDERSON, Nicholas. Prince Eugen of Savoy. London, Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1964.
- HERRMANN-MASCARD, Nicole. La Censure des livres à Paris à la fin de l'ancien régime (1750-1789). Paris, Presses Universitaires de France, 1968.

HONORE, Léon (S. J.). Le Secret de la confession. Etude historico-canonique. Bruges, Beyaert, 1924.

HYRVOIX de LANDOSLE, Albert. 'J. B. Rousseau réfugié en Suisse, en Autriche et aux Pays Bas'. Revue d'histoire diplomatique, vol. xxiv (1910), pp.388-427; vol. xxv, pp.111-52.

JANNE d'OTHEE, Xavier. Ernest Ruth d'Ans, secrétaire du grand Arnauld. Verviers, Gason, 1949.

JONES, Silas Paul. A list of French prose fiction from 1700 to 1750. New York, The H. W. Wilson Co., 1939.

KAMINKER, J.-P. 'Lenglet-Dufresnoy éditeur et plagiaire de Boulainvilliers'. Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France, vol. lxix(1969), pp.209-17.

KRAUSS, Werner. 'L'Etude des écrivains obscurs du siècle des lumières'. Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, vol. xxvi(1963), pp.1019-24.

LABRACHERIE, Pierre, and MILLESPIERRES, François. La Conspiration de Cellamare, quand la duchesse du Maine conspirait. Paris, Del Duca, 1963.

LABROUSSE, Elisabeth. Pierre Bayle. The Hague, Nijhoff, 1963-4. 2 vols.

LALLEMAND, Paul (Or.). Histoire de l'éducation dans l'ancien Oratoire de France. Paris, Châtillon-sur-Seine, 1888.

LANERY d'ARC, Pierre. Le Livre d'or de Jeanne d'Arc: bibliographie raisonnée et analytique des ouvrages relatifs à Jeanne d'Arc. Paris, H. Leclerc et Cornuau, 1894.

LANSON, Gustave. 'Origines et premières manifestations de l'esprit philosophique dans la littérature française'. Revue des cours et conférences, XVIIe année (1907-08), nos. 7, 10, 13, 16, 18, 21, 23, 26, 28, 31, 33, 35; XVIIe année (1908-09), nos. 2-7, 11, 16, 19, 22, 24, 27, 29, 31, 32, 34, 36; XVIIIe année (1909-10), nos. 1, 3, 6, 12, 16, 23.

LANSON, Gustave. 'Questions diverses sur l'histoire de l'esprit philosophique en France avant 1750'. Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France, vol. xix(1912), pp.1-29, and 293-317.

LAUNAY, Albert. 'L'Ancien Collège de Beauvais (1545-1793)'. Bulletin de la société d'étude historique, géographique et scientifique de la région parisienne, 1954, no. 82-83, pp.1-20; no. 84, pp.11-27.

LEBER, C., SALGUES, J.-B., and COHEN, J. (ed.). Collection des meilleurs dissertations, notices et traités particuliers relatifs à l'histoire de France. Paris, Dentu, 1826-38. 20 vols.

LECLERCQ, Henri (O.S.B.). Histoire de la Régence pendant la minorité de Louis XV. Paris, Champion, 1921. 3 vols.

LEDIEU, François. Mémoires et journal sur la vie et les ouvrages de Bossuet. Paris, Didier, 1856.

LEMONTEY, Pierre-Edouard. Histoire de la Régence et de la minorité de Louis XV jusqu'au ministère du Cardinal de Fleury. Paris, Paulin, 1832. 2 vols.

LEWIS, Warren Hamilton. The Sunset of the splendid century, the life and times of Louis Auguste de Bourbon, duc du Maine, 1670-1736. London, Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1955.

LOMBARD, Alfred. L'Abbé Du Bos, un initiateur de la pensée moderne (1670-1742). Paris, Hachette, 1913.

LOUGH, John. The Contributions to the 'Encyclopédie'. London, Grant and Cutler, 1973.

MAHIEU, Léon. Jansénisme et antijansénisme dans le diocèse de Boulogne-sur-Mer et de Tourai, spécialement dans la région Lilloise. Lille, 1948. [Mémoires et travaux de la faculté catholique de Lille, no. 54].

MARAIS, Matthieu. Journal et mémoires sur la régence et le règne de Louis XV, 1715-1737. Paris, Mesnil, 1863-8. 4 vols.

MARION, Michel. Recherches sur les bibliothèques privées à Paris au milieu du XVIIIème siècle (1750-1759). Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale, 1978.

MARLBOROUGH, John Churchill, duke of. The letters and dispatches of John Churchill, first Duke of Marlborough, from 1702-1712. Ed. George Murray. London, Murray, 1845. 5 vols.

MARTIN, Henri-Jean. Livre, pouvoirs et société à Paris au XVIIe siècle (1598-1701). Genève, Droz, 1969. 2 vols.

MARTIN, Henry. Histoire de la Bibliothèque de l'Arsenal. Paris, Plon, 1899.

MASSON, Frédéric (ed.). Journal inédit de Jean-Baptiste Colbert, marquis de Torcy, Ministre et Secrétaire d'Etat des Affaires Etrangères pendant les années 1709, 1710 et 1711. Paris, Plon, Nourrit et Cie., 1884.

MAY, Georges. Le Dilemme du roman au XVIIIe siècle, étude sur les rapports du roman et de la critique (1715-1761). Connecticut and Paris, P.U.F., 1963..

MAY, Georges. 'L'Histoire a-t-elle engendré le roman?' Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France, vol. lv(1955), pp.155-76.

MERLAND, Marie-Anne. 'Tirage et vente de livres à la fin du XVIIIe siècle: des documents chiffrés'. Revue française d'histoire du livre, 1973, pp.3-28.

MONTESQUIEU, Charles-Louis de Secondat, baron de. Oeuvres complètes. Ed. André Masson. Paris, Nagel, 1950-5. 3 vols.

MORNET, Daniel. 'Comment étudier les écrivains ou les ouvrages de troisième ou de quatrième ordre'. Romanic review, vol. xxviii(1937), pp.204-16.

MORNET, Daniel. 'Les Enseignements des bibliothèques privées (1750-1780)'. Revue d'histoire littéraire de la France, vol. xvii(1910), pp.449-97.

MORRIS, Thelma. L'abbé Desfontaines et son rôle dans la littérature de son temps. (Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, vol. xix). 1961.

MUMBY, Frank Arthur, and NORRIE, Ian. Publishing and bookselling. London, Jonathan Cape, 1974.

NARBONNE, Pierre. Journal des règnes de Louis XIV et Louis XV. Paris, Durand et Lauriel, 1866.

Neue Deutsche Biographie. Duncker and Humblot, Berlin, 1952- .

Nouvelle biographie générale. Ed. Dr. Hoefer. Paris, Didot, 1857-1969.

LOUDART, J. and SGARD, J. 'La Critique du roman', in Presse et histoire au XVIIIe siècle. L'Année 1734. Ed. Pierre Rétat and Jean Sgard. Paris, C.N.R.S., 1978, pp.269-78.

PALMER, Robert. Catholics and unbelievers in eighteenth-century France. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1939.

PEIGNOT, Gabriel. Dictionnaire critique, littéraire et bibliographique des principaux livres condamnés au feu, supprimés ou censurés. Paris, Renouard, 1806. 2 vols.

PIA, Pascal. Les Livres de l'Enfer. Paris, Coulet et Faure 1978. 2 vols.

PICHON, Jérôme. Vie de Charles-Henry, comte de Hoym, ambassadeur de Saxe-Pologne en France et célèbre amateur de livres. 1694-1736. Paris, Techener, 1880. 2 vols.

PINOT, Virgile. La Chine et la formation de l'esprit philosophique en France, 1640-1740. Paris, Geuthner, 1932.

PLANT, Marjorie. The English book-trade. An economic history of the making and sale of books. London, Allen and Unwin, 1974.

PRECLIN, Edmond. Les Jansénistes du XVIIIe siècle et la Constitution civile du clergé. Paris, Gamber, 1929.

PROUST, Jacques. Diderot et l'Encyclopédie. 2nd edition. Paris, Colin, 1967.

PROUST, Jacques. L'Encyclopédie. Paris, Colin, 1965.

PRUNEL, M. 'Les premiers séminaires en France au XVIIIe siècle'. Etudes, Feb. 1909, pp.344-55.

QUERARD, Joseph-Marie. La France littéraire ou Dictionnaire bibliographique des savants, historiens et gens de lettres de la France, ainsi que des littérateurs étrangers qui ont écrit en français, plus particulièrement pendant les XVIIIe et XIXe siècles. Paris, Firmin Didot, 1827-39. 10 vols.

Additions et corrections, Paris, Maisonneuve, 1854-64. 2 vols.

QUERARD, Joseph-Marie. Les supercheries littéraires dévoilées, 3rd edition. Paris, Daffis, 1869-1879. 8 vols.

QUIGNON, Hector. La Bibliothèque de la ville de Beauvais. Paris, Champion, 1904.

RAVAISSON, François. Archives de la Bastille, Documents inédits. Paris, Durand et Pedone-Lauriel, 1866-1904. 16 vols.

RICHER, Edmond. La Première histoire en date de Jeanne d'Arc. Histoire de la Pucelle d'Orléans, par Edmond Richer. Ed. P. Dunand. Paris, Desclée, de Brouwee et Cie.. 2 vols.

RIGAL, Juliette. 'L'Iconographie de la Henriade au XVIIIe siècle ou la naissance du style troubadour'. Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, vol. xxii (1965), pp.23-71.

ROCQUAIN, Félix. L'Esprit révolutionnaire avant la Revolution, 1715-1789; Paris, Plon, 1878.

ROTHSCHILD, J. de. Catalogue des livres composant la bibliothèque de feu M. le Baron J. de Rothschild. Chiefly compiled by himself, and completed by E. Picot. Paris, [privately printed], 1884-1929. 5 vols.

ROUSSEAU, André-Michel. L'Angleterre et Voltaire. (Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, vols.cxliv-vii). 1976. 3 vols.

SAINTE-BEUVE, Charles Augustin de. Portraits littéraires. Paris, Garnier, 1862-4. 3 vols.

SAINT-SIMON, Louis de Rouvroy, duc de. Ecrits inédits. Ed. Armand-Prosper Faugère. Paris, Hachette, 1880-93. 8 vols.

SAINT-SIMON, Louis de Rouvroy, duc de. Mémoires. Paris, Gallimard (Coll. Pléiade), 1961. 7 vols.

SAUVY, Anne. Livres saisis à Paris entre 1678 et 1701. The Hague, Nijhoff, 1972.

SAYCE, R. A. 'Compositorial practices and the localization of printed books'. The Library, vol. xxi (1966), pp.1-45.

SCHWAB, Richard N., REX, Walter E., and LOUGH, John. Inventory of Diderot's Encyclopédie. (Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, vols. lxxx and lxxxiii), 1971.

SEGAL, Lester Abraham. 'Lenglet Du Fresnoy: the treason of a cleric in eighteenth-century France'. Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, cxvi(1973), pp.251-79.

SEGAL, Lester Abraham. Nicolas Lenglet du Fresnoy (1674-1755): a study of historical criticism and methodology in early eighteenth-century France. Thesis Columbia University, 1968 (D.A.I. vol. xxx, no. 2, Aug. 1969, 641-A).

SEGAL, Lester Abraham. 'Tradition and change in French historiographical thought of the early eighteenth century'. Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, vol. xcvi, pp.69-117 (1972).

SEILHAC, Victor de. L'Abbé Dubois, premier ministre de Louis XV. Paris, Amyot, 1862. 2 vols.

SGARD, Jean (ed.). Dictionnaire des journalistes, 1600-1789. Grenoble, Presses Universitaires de Grenoble, 1976.

SGARD, Jean. Prévost romancier. Paris, Corti, 1968.

SHACKLETON, Robert. Montesquieu, a critical biography. London, O.U.P., 1961.

SIMON, Renée. A la recherche d'un homme et d'un auteur. Essai de bibliographie des ouvrages du comte de Boulainviller. Paris, Boivin, n.d.

SIMON, Renée. Henri de Boulainviller, historien, politique, philosophe, astrologue, 1658-1722. Paris, Boivin, 1942.

SIMON, Renée. Nicolas Fréret, académicien. (Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, vol. xvii). 1961.

SWARTE, Victor de. Un Intendant, Secrétaire d'Etat au XVIIIe siècle, Claude Le Blanc, sa vie, sa correspondance (1669-1729). Dunkerque, Imprimerie Dunkerquoise, 1900.

TANS, J. A. G. 'Les Idées politiques des Jansénistes'. Neophilologus, 1956, pp.1-18.

TARGE, Maxime. Professeurs et régents de collège dans l'ancienne Université de Paris. Paris, Hachette, 1902.

TORREY, Norman L. 'Boulainvilliers: the man and the mask'. Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, vol. i(1955), pp.159-73.

VERCRUYSSSE, Jerom. 'Jeanne d'Arc au siècle des lumières'. Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, vol. xc, pp.1659-1729.

VERNIERE, Paul. Spinoza et la pensée française avant la Révolution. Paris, P.U.F., 1954. 2 vols.

VIATTE, Gérard. 'L'Oratoire et l'éducation des clercs. Le séminaire Saint-Magloire'. Oratoriana, vol. i (1931), pp.46-60.

VILLARS, Claude-Louis-Hector, duc de. Mémoires du Maréchal de Villars, Paris, Rénouard, 1884-1904. 6 vols.

VOLTAIRE, François-Marie Arouet de. Correspondence and related documents. Ed. Theodore Besterman. 2nd edition. Banbury, Voltaire Foundation, 1968-76. 51 vols.

VOLTAIRE, François-Marie Arouet de. La Henriade. Ed. O. R. Taylor. 2nd edition. (Oeuvres complètes de Voltaire, vol. ii). Geneva, Institut et Musée Voltaire, 1970.

WADE, Ira O. The intellectual development of Voltaire. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1969.

WADE, Ira O. The Clandestine organization and diffusion of philosophic ideas in France from 1700 to 1750. Princeton, Princeton University Press, 1938.

WEIL, Françoise. Jean Bouhier et sa correspondance. Paris, Université Paris-Sorbonne, 1975. 3 vols.

WILKINS, K. S. 'The Irrational in eighteenth-century France'. Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, vol. cxi (1975), pp.107-201.

WILKINS, K. S. 'The Treatment of the supernatural in the Encyclopédie'. Studies on Voltaire and the 18th century, vol. xc (1972), pp.1757-71.

ZELLER, Gaston. Les Temps modernes. (Histoire des relations internationales, vol. iii). Paris, Hachette, 1955, vol. ii.